237

Third Narrative

OF THE

PROCEEDINGS

At *TURNERS-HALL*,

The Twenty First Day of *April* 1698.

Giving an exact Account of the Proofs brought by *George Keith*, out of the Quakers Printed Books, at the ſame Meeting, in full and large Quotations, oppoſing Four great Fundamental Doctrines of the Chriſtian Faith, as they were read by *G. Keith* out of his Manuſcript, and examined by ſome Miniſters of the Church of *England* there preſent, who compared each Quotation, with the Quakers Printed Books laid open before them.

With Various Notes and Obſervations by G. K. *on ſeveral Paſſages, and ſome Additions of other Proofs not then read. And the Atteſtation given by the ſaid Miniſters, reſpecting the Proofs.*

ALSO

W. Penn's Letter to *George Keith*, ſent by the Quakers to be read at the ſaid Meeting, and which was read, and *George Keith*'s Letter in Anſwer to the ſame; and a Poſtſcript to the Readers. Likewiſe a Letter of *G. K.* to *George Whitehead* in anſwer to his.

By GEORGE KEITH.

London, Printed for *C. Brome* at the *Gun* at the Weſt-End of St. *Paul's Church-yard*. 1698.

The Atteſtation given by ſome Miniſters of the Church of England, *reſpecting the Proofs.*

WE whoſe Names are hereunto Subſcribed, with the conſent of the *Lord Biſhop of London*, upon Mr. *Keith*'s earneſt Requeſt, were preſent at *Turners-Hall*, *April* 21. 1698, to hear the Quotations made by Mr. *Keith*, out of ſome of the *Principal Quakers* Books, there produced by him. We then examin'd the ſaid Quotations, and found them exactly agreeing with the Books. We have alſo ſince compar'd a Printed Copy of the Papers he then Read, and found the ſame Agreement there, excepting only ſome little Miſtakes of the Printer, moſt of which however we Corrected, and have caus'd to be put amongſt the *Errata*. We are very ſorry to find ſuch manifeſt Proofs, that *thoſe Quakers*, whoſe Words he hath Recited, have taught ſuch Doctrins as he hath charged them with; and do heartily pray for ſuch of them as are ſtill living, that God would *open their Eyes, and give them Repentance to the acknowledging of the Truth, as it is in Jeſus.*

At the ſame time we cannot but with great Compaſſion reflect upon the Condition of many Ignorant, and we hope well meaning People, who have been miſlead by them: And although we pretend to give no

no other *Judgment* in this Case, than what any *private Christian* may lawfully do; yet we think our selves obliged, upon this Occasion to warn others, especially those under our particular Care, to beware of *all such Teachers*, as take not *the Holy Scriptures* for the *Rule* of their *Faith* and *Doctrin*.

May 28, 1698.

Thomas Whincop, D. D.
William Bedford, D. D.
Lilly Butler, M. A.
Samuel Bradford, M. A.

The Four Fundamental Doctrins of the Christian Faith Opposed, &c.

THE four Fundamental Doctrins of the Christian Faith opposed and denyed by the Quakers, whose Names hereafter follow, with the Proofs Quoted out of their Books, as they were read by *George Keith* out of his Manuscript, at a Meeting at *Turners-Hall*, on the Twenty first Day of the Month, called *April*, 1698, and Examined by some Ministers of the Church of *England*, who were there present at his desire, to make an Examination of the Truth and Fidelity of his Quotations, by comparing the Passages read by him on each of the four Heads, with the Printed Books of the Quakers laid open before them, with Directions to the particular Pages of the several Books respecting each Head.

The first Head Opposed by them.

That it is necessary to our Salvation for us to have Faith in Christ, as he outwardly Suffered Death at *Jerusalem*, Rose and Ascended into Heaven, and is in Heaven without us in the true Nature of Man; having the true Soul and Body of Man now in Heaven, even the same in Substance he had on Earth; which Soul and Body of Christ as Man are Created.

The Second Head Opposed by them.

That we are Justified and Sanctified by the Blood of Christ outwardly Shed.

The third Head, Opposed by them.

That there is a Resurrection of the Body that Dyeth.

The fourth Head, Opposed by them.

That Christ is to come without us in his Glorified Body; even the same that Suffered Death for our Sins, to Judge the Quick and the Dead.

The Proofs (out of their Books) of their Opposing the first Head.

I. *George Whitehead*, in his Book, called, *The Light and Life of Christ within*, Printed at *London*, 1668, page 38. Brings in *William Burnet*, a Baptist Teacher, saying, Bapt. Now the Quakers would be so far from directing Men to go to the Material Temple, that they make it but a Vain Thing to look to *Jerusalem*, to the Antitype of that Temple, *viz.* To Jesus Christ as he was there Crucified, or to that Blood that was there Shed for Justification.

Ans. The Quakers see no need of directing Men to the Type for the Antitype, *viz.* neither to the outward Temple, nor yet to *Jerusalem*, *either* * *to Jesus Christ or his Blood*; knowing that neither the Righteousness of Faith, nor the word of it doth so direct, *Rom.* 10. And is it the Baptists Doctrin to direct Men to the Material Temple and *Jerusalem*, the Type for the Antitype? What Non sense and Darkness is this! And

* *Note*, T. E. *in his* Truth Defended, *saith, it should have been Printed* for, *which mends not the Matter.*

where doth the Scriptures ſay, the Blood was there Shed for Juſtification, and that Men muſt be directed to *Jeruſalem* to it? Whereas that Blood Shed is not in Being, p. 40.

II. Again, in p. 61 of the ſame Book, in Oppoſition to *W. B.* he ſaith. ——But mark how one while, *W. B.* makes that Blood, and the Shedding of it, his† Juſtifier, Redeemer, *&c.* which he has confeſſed is not in Being. Another while People muſt ſeek their Saviour above the Clouds and Firmament, p. 33. contrary to the Righteouſneſs of Faith, *Rom.* 10. 6. Another while they muſt look to *Jeruſalem* for Juſtification, * to the Blood that was there Shed, p. 24. contrary to *Deut.* 30. 13, 14. and *Rom.* 10. And if Men ſhould look to *Jeruſalem for that* † Blood, is not there to be found; for it is not in Being, ſaye *W. B.* What Confuſion, what a Labyrinth and Uncertainty is he in?

† *Here he wrongs* W. B's *Words and Senſe; he having ſaid we are Juſtified and Redeemed by that Blood.*

* *Note, Here again is to the Blood, not* for.

† *Here it appears that* G. W. *did uſe* to *and* for *in the ſame Senſe.*

III. Again, In p. 8 of the ſame Book, he ſaith, *W. B.* tells of looking to *Jeruſalem to* Jeſus Chriſt, as he was there Crucified; or *to* the Blood that was there Shed, [a Contradiction] That Chriſt that Reſtoreth Man's Loſs, is both to be ſought and found in Heaven; but in Contradiction to both p. 21. He ſaith the Reception of the Spirit, the * only means ——the Gift of Chriſt to us, and his being Revealed in us by his Spirit.

* *Here for Illuſtration, I ſhall quote the Paſſage* G. W. *refers to in* W. B's *Book, called,* Capital Principles, *p.* 21. *But further* (ſaith W. B.) *the Reception of the Spirit is ſo far from acquitting of a Man from his Obedience to, and walking by the Scriptures; that it is the only means to put a Man into a capacity for, and give him Right to Obedience. Note, here he makes Chriſt to be ſought and found in Heaven; and his being Revealed in us by his Spirit, a* Contradiction; *and ſeeing this laſt according to* G. W. *is true, the former in his Senſe muſt be falſe.*

IV. Again, *G. W.* in another Book of his, called, *Truth Defending the Quakers and their Principles,* Printed at *London,* 1659. bringeth in *C. Wade,* ſaying. p. 65. *C. Wade* affirmeth that our bleſſed Saviour doth inſtruct Men to lay faſt hold of, and to abide in ſuch a Faith which confideth in himſelf, being without Men. *G. W.* replyeth. *Anſ.* That's contrary to the Apoſtles Doctrin, who Preached the Word of Faith that was in their Hearts; and the Saints Faith ſtood in the *Power of God which was in them.

* *Note, he makes it inconſiſtent, that the Saints Faith ſtands in the Power of God, and that they confide in* Chriſt *without them; both which do ſo well agree, that they are inſeparable, and the Faith is one whereby they do both.*

V. Again in the ſame Book, in Anſwer to *T. Smiths* Queſtion, p. 23. Q. 43. When you tell us that ye have Faith in *Chriſt,* do you mean *Chriſt* whoſe Perſon is now Aſcended into Heaven above the Clouds? or do you mean only a *Chriſt* within you? *G. W.* replyeth, *Anſ.* Here thou wouldſt make two *Chriſts,* a *Chriſt* whoſe Perſon is above the Clouds, and a *Chriſt* within. But how proveſt thou † two ſuch *Chriſts?* We have Faith in that *Chriſt* that deſcended

† *Nothing was inſinuated in the Query of two* Chriſts; *but in* G. W.'s *Senſe,* Chriſt's *Perſon aſcended into Heaven a-*

deſcended from the Father, who is the ſame that aſcended far above all Heavens, that he might fill all things; and this *Chriſt* we witneſs in us, who is not divided.

bove the Clouds, and Chriſt *within would make two* Chriſts, *and ſeeing there is but one* Chriſt, *he is not a Perſon without us in Heaven, in his Senſe.*

VI. Again, *G. Whitehead* in another Book of his call'd *Chriſt Aſcended above the Clouds.* —— *His Divinity, Light in Man vindicated, from the Cloudy, Erroneous, Heretical, and Blaſphemous Conceits of* John Newman, *and his Brethren*; in p. 24. brings *J. N.* ſaying, By denying any perſonal Being of *Chriſt*, without all Men, at the right hand of *God*, but *only a feigned Chriſt* within them, then remiſſion of Sins muſt dye, and Faith alſo, for want of the Object *Chriſt*. *G. W.* replyeth.

Anſw. This manner of excluding *God*'s right Hand, and *Chriſt* to a Limitation out of his People in a perſonal Being (which are no Scripture Terms) ſtill implies him to be a perſonal *God* or *Chriſt*, like the *Anthropomorphits* and *Muggletonians* Conceit of him: —— For, the true Faith and its Object are inſeparable. See 2 *Cor.* 13. 5. So that their knowledge and proof of their being in the Faith, was their knowledge of *Jeſus Chriſt* in them, as their Foundation, *&c.* And this was not a * feigned *Chriſt*. And in him the remiſſion of Sins is known to them that are in the Faith. *Paul* was ſent to turn the *Gentiles* from Darkneſs to the Light, and from the Power of Satan to *God*, that they might receive the remiſſion of Sins, and an Inheritance among them that are † Sanctified: And this was the Light of *Chriſt* within. And the Righteouſneſs of Faith ſpeaketh on this wiſe, ſay not in thy heart (quoting *Rom.* 10. *Deut.* 30. 14.) —— Mark (ſaith he) the Righteouſneſs of Faith doth not ſhut *Chriſt* the Word (or * Object of Faith) out of the Hearts of true Believers, but the Word of Faith is nigh, even in the Heart, *&c.* And we know the Power of *God* and true Remiſſion thereby is inwardly felt by all the Children of the Light; and that living Faith that ſtands in the Power and Word of *God* † within ſhall not dye, nor be void, nor miſs of its Bleſſed End, which is Salvation.

* *If he be only a* Chriſt *within, and not having any perſonal Being without Men, it is a feigned* Chriſt. J. N. *did not call* Chriſt *within a feigned* Chriſt, *but a* Chriſt *only within, which is the plain ſtate of the Controverſie betwixt* G. W. *and him.*

† *Note, he leaves out the words after Sanctified,* --- Through Faith that is in me, *Acts* 26. 18. *Which* Me *was* Jeſus *of* Nazareth, *Acts* 22. 7, 8. *And this was the Glorified Man,* Jeſus *without Men, and not the* Light *only within Men.*

* *Nor doth it exclude or ſhut out the Man* Chriſt, *in Heaven without us, from being the Object of Faith, but propoſeth him to us as the great Object of our Faith, even him who dyed and roſe again,* Rom. 10. 6, 7, 8, 9.

† *Here note, he makes the Object of Faith to be only within Men, and will not own any* Chriſt *without Men; who dyed for our Sins, roſe and aſcended, &c. to be the Obj ct of Faith; for, as before is proved,* to conſide in Chriſt, (*he thinks*) without Men *is contrary to the Apoſtles Doctrine,* Rom. 10.

VII. Next let us hear *William Baily*, who was a great Preacher among the Quakers, whoſe Books they have Re-printed in a Collection. Page 600. of the Collection, he ſaith, The Apoſtle Preach-

od *Christ*, the Word, nigh in the Heart, and in the Mouth, and the ingrafted Word is able to ſave the Soul; ſo he did not Preach a viſible *Chriſt*, with Fleſh and Bones as you do. —— And *Paul* Preached *God* that made the World, that was not far from every one of us, the inviſible *God*, but you Preach a viſible Man, with Fleſh, and Bones, at a great diſtance from all People, above, where the Sun, Moon, and Stars are.

VIII. Again, the ſame *W. Baily* p. 308. —— And ſo he taught them to Pray, *Our Father*, &c. Not to look at his Perſon, and to Pray to him as a * Perſon without them, but bid them Pray to their Father.

IX. The ſame Doctrin hath *William Shewen*, of great Note among the Quakers for his Books (who is but lately Deceaſed,) In a Book of his called, *A ſmall Treatiſe*, concerning evil Thoughts he ſaith, p. 37. Not to *Jeſus* the Son of *Abraham*, *David*, and *Mary*, *Saint*, or Angel, but to *God* the Father, All Worſhip, Honour and Glory is to be given, through *Jeſus* † *Chriſt*, &c.

And in the end of this Page 37. to p. 39. he hath a ſtrange ſort of Doctrin, which for the ſtrangeneſs of it, and the groſs Perverſions of Scripture, I think fit that you hear it.

Now (ſaith he) when the true Chriſtian hath Travelled through Multiplicity into Unity, through the various Diſpenſations, Operations, and Workings of the Spirit of God, before the Law, under the Law, through the Law, to the Prophets, and to the Miniſtration of *John*, and ſo to *Jeſus*, the Son of *Abraham*, *David*, and *Mary*, and hath followed him from the * Manger to the Croſs, and from thence to the Grave, and know a being Dead and Buried with him, and a Riſing with him; and not only ſeeking thoſe things that are above, but hath found them, having known and experienced *Chriſt* in all his Offices; as the great Ordinance of *God*, as a Mediator, Reconciler, Interceſſor, maker of Peace, [*He adds in the Margin, theſe things are not only to be Read, Profeſſed, and Talked of, but experimentally known*;] Healer of the Wound, and maker up of the Breach of the Firſt *Adam*, made as a quickning Spirit, and Lord from Heaven, as a King, Prieſt, and Prophet, as a Saviour,

* *Note, If they are not to pray to him, as a Perſon without them, they are not to believe in him (by the ſame Reaſon) as a Perſon without them, But* Chriſt *not only conſider'd as* the Word, *who is Omnipreſent, and in all Men and Things, but as* made Fleſh, *and having taken the true Nature of Man into a Perſonal Union therewith, and repleniſhing the ſame with the Fulneſs of the Godhead, and with all Fulneſs of Grace and Truth, is the Object of the Chriſtian Worſhip, together with the Father, and the Holy Spirit principally Dwelling and Reſiding in him.*

† *Note, This* Jeſus Chriſt, *&c. muſt be the Light within, and not* Jeſus *the Son of* Abraham, *in his ſenſe.*

* *Whether this* Manger, Croſs, Grave *be the outward that was in* Judea; *if yea, how doth this agree with* G. W.'s *ſaying, the Quakers ſee no need to direct to* Jeſus Chriſt *as he Suffered at* Jeruſalem? *If not without, but within, then how is* Chriſt, *after he is born within, laid in the Manger, and after that Slain, Crucified, Buried? Is it not abominable, that* Chriſt *muſt (after he is Born in every Saint) be Slain, Crucified, Buried, then Riſe and Aſcend? This is plain Ranteriſm; for it makes all the Saints (ſome at leaſt after they are Saints) to be under a neceſſity of turning Apoſtates and Infidels, like the* Jews, *to kill* Chriſt *inwardly as they killed him outwardly. Woful experience aſſerted and taught here by* W. Shewen.

viour, Sanctifier and Redeemer, as a Purifier and maker an end of Sin, and bringer in of Everlasting Righteousness, and as a High Priest to present to *God*, without Spot or Wrinkle, or any such thing. When he is thus known to perform all these Offices, in and for his People, he is then by such known to sit down at the right Hand of *God*, having accomplished the Work the Father gave him to do, having put all things under, and restored all things into their Primitive Order; He then is also known to surrender up the Kingdom to the Father, and *God* to become all in all. Here the First is known to be the Last, and the Last First, the Beginning the End, and the End the Beginning; and the Heavenly Rest with him, who is without Beginning or End. [*He adds in the Margin, this is the Ascending of* Christ *up, where he was before he Descended, and before there was any Cause for his Descension; he that can understand let him. This the* Lord *is known One, and his Name One.*]

This we see, how wretchedly he perverts, not only Christ's *Ascension to an Ascension within, but that great Scripture Prophesy,* 1 Cor. 15. 24. &c. *to* 29. *concerning* Christ's *surrendring up the Kingdom to* God *the Father,* &c. *He makes it already fulfilled in such who have attained that state described by him. This is directly the abominable Heresie of* Hymeneus *and* Philetus, *who did overthrow the Faith, by saying the Resurrection was past already. For,* Christ's *surrendring the Kingdom to* God *the Father, followeth in order after the Resurrection of the Dead,* 1 Cor. 15. 23. 24. &c. *to* 29.

XI. Another proof is from *Edward Burrough*, one of the greatest Note among the Quakers, next to *George Fox* when Living, whose Works the Second Days Meeting of the Quakers hath Collected and Printed; but in some things hath castrated, and also added some things and changed, and yet all fathered upon the *Spirit*. In the Collection of his Works p. 306. He brings *John Bunion*, saying, they that follow *Christ* aright, must follow him without, to the Cross without, for Justification, or Mount *Calvary* without, they must seek for Justification without; the Spirit of *Christ*, it leads to *Christ* without. To this he Answers. Reader, See if this be not near unto Popery, or enquire else what he means, as if he would have People to go a * Pilgrimage, and this he says is contrary to *Rom.* 10.

This same W. Shewen, *in his Treatise call'd,* The true Christian Faith, *&c. p.* 40. 42. *makes* Christ *to be the Anointing, which is false both in Language and Doctrin; for,* Christ *is the Anointed, and the Holy Ghost is the Anointing, wherewith* Christ *was, and is Anointed above measure.*

* *It is plain, that* J. Bunion, *who was a Baptist Teacher of good Report, did not mean that he would have People go a Pilgrimage, to Mount* Calvary, *but that the Spirit of* Christ *in Believers, led them to Eye* Christ *as he Suffered without them, that by Faith in him, the great and only Sacrifice, they might have Remission of Sins, and Justification. Therefore, as* E. Bur. *did grosly pervert the words of* J. B. *so it's plain he did think, that to direct to* Christ *without Men, as the Object of Faith, was contrary to* Rom. 10.

XI. Again, p. 150, 151. He hath, among other, these Queries. Q. What is that which worketh Faith? and where it is, within or without? ---- Is that within the Creature or without him, which works the New Birth? —— Is not the Light of *God* sufficient in it self, to lead unto *God*, all that follow it, yea, or nay? —— Whether it is possible, that any can be Saved without *Christ* manifest within? If no, Then whether it is not the Doctrin of Salvation.

Salvation which is *only* neceſſary, to Preach *Chriſt* within? —— And is it not the whole Myſtery of Salvation, *God* manifeſt in the Fleſh? [*By Fleſh it is plain he means the Fleſh of the Saints.*] —— And is he not a † Deceiver, that exhorts People for Salvation to *any other thing* than the Light of *Chriſt*, yea, or nay? And how hath *Chriſt* enlightned every Man in the World, if not within him?

† *Note, though theſe be Queries, it is evident they have a poſitive Senſe, as is frequent, both in Scripture, and other Writers; that Queries put to an Opponent are ſtrong Poſitions.*

XII. And like to this is the Doctrine of *George Whitehead*, In his Book call'd, *An Antidote againſt the Venome of the Snake.* The Author of the Snake is quoted by *George Whitehead*, p. 27. thus, That moſt of all, are they inraged againſt *G. K.* for Preaching up the neceſſity of a *Chriſt* without, and that the Light within is not ſufficient to Salvation, without ſomething elſe, that is, *Chriſt Jeſus* without us, Suffering and Dying outwardly for us. To this *G. W.* replyeth, 1. We are not offended at *G. K.*'s Preaching *Chriſt*, or his Suffering and Dying without us truly conſidered: But 2*ly*. At his undervaluing * the Light within, as not ſufficient to Salvation, or not ſufficient without ſomething elſe; ſeeing *G. K.* confeſſeth, that the Light within, in a true Senſe, is *God* and *Chriſt*, the Eternal and Eſſential Word.

* *Note, That the ſomething elſe (meant by me) without which the Light within cannot ſave us, is* the Manhood of *Chriſt*, and his Death and Sufferings, Reſurrection, Aſcenſion, Interceſſion for us in Heaven, *as hath been oft declared by me, both in Print, and by word of Mouth, and is not denyed by* G. W. *But if our whole Salvation be placed upon the Eternal and Eſſential Word, without the Manhood of* Chriſt, *and his Death and Sufferings,* &c. *Then* Chriſt *is only our Saviour as* God, *and not as both* God *and Man, contrary both to Scripture and the Faith of all* Chriſtendom, *particularly that of the Church of* England, Art. 2. 8, 18. *And notwithſtanding* G. W.*'s ſmooth Words afterward, owning* Chriſt *without, and* God*'s reſpect to him; his Mediation, Suffering, and Dying for us, in his ſo Saving us,* p. 28. Antidote. *Yet all this is but like a* Judas *Kiſs, and no more than what any* Pelagian, *or* Socinian, *or ſome* Deiſts *would, and do own. While he makes it an Error in me, to ſay, the Light within Men is not ſufficient to Salvation without ſomething elſe, that is* Chriſt *without us, as he Dyed and Suffered for us,* &c. *Note here alſo, how* Th. Elwood, *who hath appeared in Print as* G.W.*'s Advocate, it contradicted by* G. W. *himſelf, in this very thing.*

XIII. My next Proof I ſhall bring from *W. Penn*, whoſe Authority and Note, among the People called Quakers, is ſufficiently known, in his Book called, *Quakeriſm, A New Nick-Name for Old Chriſtianity*, p. 12. He brings in *John Faldo*, charging the Quakers thus, to prove that Quakeriſm was no Chriſtianity; Chriſtianity was introduc'd by Preaching the promiſed Meſſiah, and pointing at his Humane Perſon, [*He means his Nature of Manhood, Perſonally united to his Godhead,*] but Quakeriſm by Preaching a Light within. To this *W. Penn* Anſwers, that this is nothing injurious to the Quakers at all, [*Note, He takes with the Charge, and confeſſeth to it; a ſad Confeſſion, that Quakeriſm was not Introduc'd by Preaching the promiſed Meſſiah, but the Light within. If his Quakeriſm had been true Chriſtianity, it would have been Introduc'd both by Preaching the Promiſed Meſſiah, and the Spiritual Bleſſings of Grace, and Light, and divine Spirit within that we have by him, which was ever my Quakeriſm, and ſo I hope it is of divers others among the People called Quakers. And thus I hope the difference doth appear betwixt the Deiſt-Quaker, and the Chriſtian-Quaker; But I Renounce the Name of Quaker*

Origi-

(Originally given as a Nick-name, if we will believe W. P. *tho' now he and they seem to Glory in it) and desire to approve my self in Doctrin and Conversation a true Christian, according to the Holy Scriptures]*

but highly on their side; for had they Preached a Christ, now coming in the Flesh, they had denyed his truly and only great visible Appearance at *Jerusalem* (which all true Quakers † own) since then they believe that Appearance, but therefore need not Preach what is not to be again. And that the whole Christian World hath so long and lazily depended on it, without their thirsting after his inward holy Appearance in the Conscience.

† *How do they own it and believe it? surely not with a Faith necessary to Salvation, but as a bare Historical Faith, and even that is not necessary to be believed, in his Sense, seeing it is not necessary to be Preached; and how did the Quakers believe it, if not without Preaching, Hearing, or Reading? But seeing he thinks the Quakers need not now Preach it; how shall their Children believe it; seeing they think it not needful to Preach it to them; nor do they allow them to hear others Preach it; if it be said their Children may read it in the Bible, and so may they read of Christ and the Light within. All this doth plainly shew they judge it not necessary for their Proselytes to have the Faith of Christ without, in order to Salvation. The miserable Shifts and Evasions,* T. Elwood *hath used to excuse this Passage of* W. Penn; *and many other Passages in the Quakers Books, are sufficiently discovered in the late Book, called,* Satan Disrob'd.

XIV. Again, p. 6. the distinction betwixt Moral and Christian, the making Holy Life Legal, and Faith in the History of Christ's outward Manifestation; [*so should the Words be read by the direction of the Table of Errata; and not as* T. El. *by Transposing them, would Cloak them*] has been a deadly Poyson, these latter Ages have been Infected with, to the Destruction of Godly Living. And p. 3. This (to wit the Quakers Doctrin) doth not make Christianity a distinct thing in kind, from what was worthy, as he calls it, that is Godly among either *Jews* or *Heathens*; but that Christ did by his visible Appearance, benefit the World with a more Glorious Manifestation of the same Divine Power, Purity, Truth, Wisdom and Righteousness, than former Ages were either capable of, or attended with. [*Note, Though this is true, with respect to the* Jews *and* Patriarchs, *and believing Antients from* Adam *to Christ; yet it is altogether false, with respect to the Heathen, whom he puts in the same Class with the* Jews. *For though it was one and the same Divine Eternal Power and Wisdom of God that gave any true Manifestation and Discovery of God of his Being, and Attributes, and Laws of Justice and Temperance to Heathens, as well as to* Jews; *yet the manner of the Illumination and Knowledge given of God generally to Heathens, was of an Inferior Kind, to what was given to Faithful* Jews *and Antient* Patriarchs; *making known to them the Promised* Messiah, *as he was to come in the Flesh by special Revelation through the Holy Prophets, and their Prophecies accompanied with special inward Illuminations, given to these Faithful Ancients; which the generality of the Heathen World had not then, and which many of them yet have not. To confirm his False Doctrin with respect to the* Heathens, *he adds*] For if no Name be given, but the Name of Christ, under the whole Heaven, by which Men can be saved, then either Christ was always in some Measure or other a Saviour, and such as were saved in some degree or other, Christians, or there was one Saviour before Christ's outward coming, and another since; or lastly, all that were Antecedent to that Appearance were Damned.' [To this 'I Answer, The Saviour was one, both before and since Christ's outward 'coming; and though his Assuming the visible Flesh, and Nature of Man into 'a Personal Union with himself, makes him not another Saviour; yet what he

'so

'ſo Aſſumed was neceſſary to the Salvation of Men, from the beginning of the 'World, to the end of it; and whatever be God's purpoſe towards *Heathens* 'generally, as to their Final State, the Promiſes of Salvation, on which the 'Hope of Salvation is grounded, none have but by ſpecial Revelation, which 'may be allowed to ſuch *Heathens* or *Gentiles*, as God was pleaſed to give it un-'to, either, with or without outward Preaching, and other outward Means; 'and others who have had it not, they are left without Excuſe for not impro-'ving what they had, nor being Thankful to God, according to *Rom.* 1. 20, 21. 'and 2. 11, 12. And it is a great Error in *W. Penn*, and many of the Quakers, 'that under a Pretence of being Charitable to the Moral *Heathens*, and Zealouſly 'concerned for their Salvation, become Ungrateful to God and Chriſt, in De-'pretiating and Degrading Chriſtianity ſo low, as to make it nothing but a Re-'fined Deiſm, or Gentiliſm, not differing in kind therefrom; and ſo rendring 'all the Great Myſteries of the Chriſtian Faith and Religion, merely Accidental 'to Chriſtianity, and Deiſm, (or Heatheniſm) and Chriſtianity to be Eſſentially 'the ſame. But the great Controverſie betwixt the Chriſtians and theſe Quakers, 'is not about the Salvation of the Moral *Heathens*, or the Poſſibility thereof, 'without an outward Preacher, or Miniſtry. But whether the Faith of Chriſt, 'as he is both God and Man, and yet one Chriſt, and as he Suffered Death in 'his Manhood-nature for our Sins, Roſe again and Aſcended, is neceſſary to 'our Salvation in *Chriſtendom*; and whether according to the ordinary Method 'of Divine Providence, Men have this Faith, without outward Means of Inſtru-'ction, as the Holy Scriptures and Preaching?]

XV. Again, *W. Penn*, in his *Addreſs to Proteſtants*, Printed at *London*, 1697. p. 119. ſaith, Let us but ſoberly conſider what Chriſt is, and we ſhall the better know whether Moral Men are to be reckoned Chriſtians. What is Chriſt, but Meekneſs, Juſtice, Mercy, Patience, Charity, and Virtue in Perfection? Can we then deny a Meek Man to be a Chriſtian, a Juſt, a Merciful, a Patient, a Charitable, a Virtuous Man to be like Chriſt?

XVI. Again, In the ſame Book, p. 117. 118. he ſaith, But that which is moſt of all Anxious, is that Morality is denyed to be Chriſtianity, that Virtue has any claim to Grace; and that thoſe who Glory to be called Chriſtians, can be ſo Partial and Cruel, as to Renounce *a mere Juſt Man*, their Society, and ſending him packing among the *Heathen* for Damnation. And pray what's the matter? Why, though this Perſon be a Sober Liver, yet he is but a general Believer, his Faith is at large; 'tis true, he believes in God, but I hear little of his Faith in Chriſt; very well; does he not therefore believe in Chriſt; or muſt he therefore be without the Pale of Salvation? Is it poſſible, that a Man can truly believe in God, and be Damned; but as he that believes in Chriſt, believes in God; ſo he that * believes in God, believes in Chriſt?

XVII. Again, p. 121. He Quotes and Commends ſome Sayings of *John Hales*, of *Eton*, in his *Golden Remains*, among which, this is one. Now all theſe good things, which Moral Men do

* *Note, The Fallacy of his Saying; he that believes in God, believes in Chriſt, Proof of this muſt be, becauſe Chriſt is God; but as Chriſt is God, ſo he is Man alſo; and the true Chriſtian Faith is a belief in him, ſo conſidered;*

do by the Light of Nature, are a part of God's Will Written in their Hearts; wherefore, ſo far as they were Conſciencious in performing them (if *Salvianus* his Reaſon be good) ſo far have they Title and Intereſt in our Faith. And p. 122. he commends his ſaying, on the contrary ſide; let his Life be never ſo upright, if either he be little ſeen, or peradventure, is *quite ignorant of the Myſtery of Chriſt*, we eſteem of him but as Dead.

in which Conſideration, he is our Compleat Saviour, compleatly fitted and qualified ſo to be; but many thouſands have not this belief in Chriſt, who yet believe that there is a God, and may be ſaid in a Senſe to believe in him, and yet do not believe in Chriſt, though the true Chriſtians Faith is one, whereby he believes both in God and in Chriſt. John 14. 1.

XVIII. Again, *W. Penn*, in his *Rejoynder to John Faldo*, brings him in, ſaying ——For Chriſt to be in the *Gentiles*, rightly underſtood, would be no hard matter for the *Gentiles* to believe, as to believe ſuch a Glory to be attained by Faith and Obedience to the Laws of a Man, who Died as a Malefactor; and that this Death of his ſhould Reconcile God to Man, with the Addition of ſuch a Purchaſe. To this he Anſwers. This ſort of Doctrin † well becometh *J. Faldo*: I perceive I have not miſtaken him; what Carnaliſt in the World, could let have dropt a more Pernicious Sentence to the Doctrin and Kingdom of Chriſt, than to render it more difficult to believe, and lay a greater Streſs upon the * External, than the Internal Work of Chriſt? We muſt read the moſt Weighty Scriptures backward upon this Man's Principles. He hath helped us to a new way of rendring the Text; not this Myſtery among the *Gentiles*, is Chriſt in you, the hope of Glory; but this Myſtery among the *Gentiles* is a Man, who Died as a Malefactor, by his Death Reconciled to God. Behold your Expoſitor! I dare warrant, this Man's Comment will never trouble the next Collection of Criticks. At this rate the Lord Lord Cryer is highly priviledged. [*Note, This is a moſt Falſe and Unfair Inference; for* J. Faldo *had joyned Obedience with Faith, even as* W. Penn *Cites him; and this no Hypocritical Lord Lord Cryer hath*] And the *Galatians* had paſſed the moſt difficult Birth, before they had known Chriſt to be formed in them [*Note, alſo here is another Falſe and Unfair Inference*] Regeneration is a ſlight thing, in compariſon of the Knowledge of Chriſt after the Fleſh [*This is a third, Falſe and Unfair Inference; unleſs he think ſaving Faith in, and Obedience to Chriſt and his Laws, nowiſe concerned in Regeneration, but a bare Knowledge of Chriſt after the Fleſh, which is not to be valued*] This Doctrin brings not Men to Chriſt in them, the hope of Glory; but inticeth them into the vain Hope of the Hypocrite which periſheth. [*This is a fourth falſe Inference; and ſo indeed is the whole paſſage, and the whole of it moſt Scandalous and Offenſive to Chriſtian Ears*] The Hiſtory is made the greateſt Myſtery, and to believe the one, Matter of greater difficulty, than to experience the other. It's ſtrange (ſaith he) that

† *And I ſay, well becometh any true Chriſtian, for all his Idle Banter.*

* *See his Ignorance, to call the Faith and Obedience to the Laws of the Man Chriſt, who Died as a Malefactor, the External, and not the Internal Work of Chriſt; for it is evident, that by Faith,* J. Faldo *did underſtand a Faith (having Chriſt as he Died, &c. for its Object) that is the Internal Work of Chriſt, and of his Spirit, as all true Chriſtians ſo underſtand it, and as Chriſt underſtood it; when he ſaid to the* Jews, John 6. *This is the Work of God; that ye believe in him, (even the Man Jeſus, and who is God alſo, who was ſpeaking to them) whom God hath ſent, and which is a ſaving Faith, and is a great part of true Regeneration.*

ſhould be reputed moſt Myſterious which was the Introduction to the Myſtery; and theſe tranſactions counted moſt difficult, that were by the Divine Wiſdom of *God*, ordained as *ſo many facile Repreſentations of what was to be accompliſhed in Man*. In ſhort, it is to leſſen, if not totally to exclude † *the true Myſtery of Godlineſs*, which is *Chriſt* manifeſted in his Children, their hope of Glory.

† *Like to this is his ſaying in his Preface to the Collection of* R. Barley's *Books. O Reader, great is the Myſtery of Godlineſs; and if the Apoſtle ſaid it of the manifeſtation of the Son of* God *in Fleſh, if that be a Myſtery (and if a Myſtery, it is not to be ſpelt out, but by the Revelation of the Spirit) how much more is the work of Regeneration a Myſtery, that is wholly Inward and Spiritual in its Operation? who is ſufficient for theſe things? What* T. Ellwood *hath ſaid, by way of excuſe, to this Antichriſtian paſſage of* W. Penn, *See effectually refuted in* Satan Diſrob'd, *p.* 10. 11, 12. *To which, neither* T. Ellwood, *nor any other Quaker, have given any Reply to this Day.*

XIX. Again, *W. Penn*, in his *Chriſtian Quaker*, Printed at *London* 1674. ſaith, p. 97. Concerning the Seed that *God* promiſed to *Abraham*. —— This Seed muſt be Inward and Spiritual, ſince one outward thing *cannot be* the proper Figure or Repreſentation of another; [*for* is it the way of Holy Scripture ſo to teach us: The *outward Lamb, ſhews forth the inward Lamb*; the *Jew* outward, the *Jew* inward: [*And a little after, form this odd way of Reaſoning very falſly, he concludes ſaying,*] and conſequently the *Seed of the Promiſe* is an Holy and Spiritual Principle of Light, Life, and Power, that being received into the Heart, bruiſeth the Serpent's Head. And becauſe *the Seed* which cannot be that Body is *Chriſt*, as teſtifie the Scriptures, *the Seed is one*, and that Seed *Chriſt* (quoting *Gal.* 3. 16.) and *Chriſt, God* over all Bleſſed for ever; We do conclude, and that moſt truly, that *Chriſt* was, and is the Divine Word of Light and Life, that was in the beginning with *God*, and was and is *God* over all Bleſſed for ever.

The like Doctrin hath *G. Whitehead*, in his *Chriſt Aſcended*, p. 32. And as for thy Scoffing at the Word pure Seed, calling it new coined without Book, and thy ſaying, which Seed we plainly ſay is *Chriſt* begotten in us: Thou haſt ſcofft herein without any ground, and thereby diſcovered thy own Folly: For, is not the incorruptible Seed a pure Seed? And doth not the Apoſtle call the * Seed *Chriſt, Gal.* 3. 16? And is not *Chriſt* in the true Believer, where the Body is Dead becauſe of Sin?

* *Note how they pervert the Scripture, and make the Seed mentioned* Gal. 3. 16. *to be the ſame Seed mentioned* 1 Pet. 1. 23. *and* 1 Joh. 3. 9. *which is falſe; for it's certain, that the Seed* God *promiſed to* Abraham *was* Chriſt, *as he was to come out of his Loins according to the Fleſh,* Gen. 22. 18. *but the inward Principle* Abraham *had it before.*

XX. Another Proof I ſhall bring from *William Smith* (whoſe Works they have alſo Collected and Printed after his Deceaſe) of great Note among them, for a Preacher, and Writer when alive; in his Primmer, Printed at *London*, 1668 pag. 8. he ſaith, *Child*, But how may I then known which is true and which is Falſe by their Words, ſeeing Words may be the ſame? *Father*, Why, they

they that are False *Preach* * *Christ* without, and bid People believe in him, as he is in Heaven above; but they that are True Ministers, they *Preach Christ* within, and direct People to wait to feel him in themselves; and so to believe in him as he makes himself manifest in them; and this is true Doctrin, that brings People to mind that Principle of *God* in their own Consciences, which comes down from Heaven, and goes thither again; and such as are in the Earthly Wisdom, they do not know Heaven above. *C.* This is a great difference in their Doctrine, for one to *Preach Christ* without, and another *Preacheth* him within. *F.* Yes, it doth make a great difference, and hath no more Fellowship together than the *East* hath with the *West*. *C.* And is this an infallible Tryal of them? *F.* Yes, and it will not deceive thee, *&c.* *C.* But must I not try all things by the Scriptures? *F.* Nay, For the Scriptures were given forth from the Spirit, and it is the Spirit that tries whether the things be true or false, good or evil.

* *Note, after the Author's Decease, when his Works were Collected and Printed, some Alteration was made in the new Impression in Folio to this Effect; That False Ministers Preach* Christ *only without, but True Ministers Preach* Christ *not only without, but within.* (*I could not find the Book, but I am sure the words are to that Effect.*) *But, let it be observed and well considered,* 1. *That this alteration was not made by the Author himself, but some years after his Decease.* 2. *Not only the Author, but that Meeting that approved the First Edition of the Primmer is chargeable with that vile Error, in giving that as an infallible Tryal of Ministers.* 3. *That the alteration afterwards made, was surreptitiously put in, without passing any Censure upon that vile passage in the little Book, that was Printed several times, and was much dispersed in the Families of the Quakers, for the Children to be trained up in these vile Principles.* 4. *The alteration or correction made, is a plain contradiction to other passages in that same Book, never hitherto corrected. See the proof xxi.*

XXI. Again, in the same Book, p. 55. 2*d.* Part, Printed 1668. whereas there was a former Impression in the Year 1663. or 1664. as appears by the date of the Epistle to the Reader in the 2*d.* Part, called *A new Catechism*, and the Primmer was done in the Year 1661. and some time after Printed. He saith, *Q.* Where do ye hold forth this Foundation to be laid? *A.* It is laid of *God* within us, and is the Rock of our Safety; and so we hold it forth to be a sure Foundation, as knowing the Strength and Power of it, which defends it self that the Gates of Hell cannot prevail against it. [*Note, the Rock on which* Christ *said he would build his Church, was himself, even the Son of Man, as well as the Son of* God; *but this was not the inward Principle only, as he here holds it forth in the following words.*] *Q.* How do ye manifest it to be the only Foundation, and that there is not another? *A.* From the unchangableness of its *own Nature and Being*; for we know that *God* doth not lay any *visible* or changeable things for a Foundation, but that which is of himself within, and is invisible to the natural Eye, *&c.* *Q.* And is that which is within you the only Foundation, upon which you stand, and the Principle of your Religion? *A.* That of *God* within us is so, for we know it is *Christ*, and being *Christ*, it must needs be only and principal; for that which is *only* admits not of another, and that which is principal is greatest in Being: And

thus we know *Chriſt* in us to be unto us, the only and principal, who was before all things, and in whom all things conſiſt. *Q.* But do ye hold that this Foundation, and Principle within you, is ſufficient to give Eternal Life? *A.* Yes, we do ſo; and in p. 13. 1ſt. Part, he ſaith, of that in the Conſcience, *the Light of Chriſt*, that † all Power in Heaven and Earth is in it.

† *Note this perverſion, for all Power in Heaven and Earth was given to the Man* Chriſt *without us, in whom the fulneſs of the Godhead dwells, as he himſelf teſtified; but unto every one of us ſaid* Paul *is Grace given, according to the meaſure of the Gift of* Chriſt, Eph. 9. 7. *And as to that weighty Queſtion p.* 70. *What do you believe concerning that great Work, which by the Death of* Chriſt *was accompliſhed on the Croſs in time paſt, according to the Scripture; he paſſeth over the Anſwer to it in very general Words, as a Diſpenſation of* God *in times paſt, but ſaith nothing of any neceſſity of Faith in him, as he Dyed, Roſe and Aſcended, and is now in Heaven without us: But among other obſcure Words, and hardly intelligible, he ſaith, we alſo know, and believe that he is the ſame* Chriſt *in us which in* Diſpenſations paſt *did humble himſelf to the* Croſs: *Now he who did ſo was the Man* Jeſus *of* Nazareth; *but how that Man can be in them, without ſome Figure of a Trope, as the Sun is ſaid to be in a Houſe, by his Beams and Vertue of Light and Heat, is as unaccountable, as the real Preſence of* Chriſt's *Body and Soul, Fleſh and Spirit in the Conſecrated Popiſh Hoſte.*

XXII. Another Proof I ſhall bring on this Head out of a little Book of *John Pennington*, called, *The Fig Leaf Covering*, Printed at *London* 1697. and approved by the Second Days Meeting; in which Book he oppoſeth a ſaying of mine, in my late Book of Explications and Retractations, which was this.--Upon a diligent ſearch into the Holy Scriptures, I find that in all places in the New Teſtament, where the word *Goſpel* is uſed, it ſignifieth the Doctrin of Salvation, by the *promiſed Meſſiah*, that was outwardly to come, and did come in the true Nature of Man, with the Spiritual Bleſſings that Men were to receive by him, *&c.* To this he thus oppoſeth, p. 70.——Alſo when the Everlaſting Goſpel was again to be Preached after the Apoſtacy, for it ſeems by the word again [*Note, the word again is not to be found in that place cited by him, either in Engliſh or Greek, but in* George Fox's *ſome Principles*] it had been diſcontinued to be Preached, although the Hiſtory of *Chriſt's* Birth, Death, *&c.* had not; doth that place *Rev.* 14. 6. 7. mention any thing of *the Doctrin of Salvation by the promiſed Meſſiah*? there is not a word of that ſaid there, but ſaying with a loud Voice, *Fear God and give glory unto him*, &c. (being Preached with Commiſſion from on high) is called Preaching the *Everlaſting Goſpel.* Did *G. K.* in his diligent ſearch over-look this? If not, how could he ſay in all places in the New Teſtament, where the word Goſpel is uſed, it ſignifieth the Doctrin of Salvation by the promiſed Meſſiah? I might alſo inſtance (ſaith he) in *Rom.* 1. 16. (although he refuſeth to allow it me now) that the Goſpel cannot be ſaid to be the Power of *God* unto Salvation to the Believer in any other ſenſe, than as it is a powerful, energetical, inward Principle; for as it is barely Hiſtorical, the Ungodly have that Belief, [*ſee his Perverſion; Did I ever ſay it was barely Hiſtorical?*] though they want the Power; and to my ſenſe of the word *Goſpel*, *Coloſſ.* 1. 23. He oppoſeth ſaying, —— it (*viz.* the *Goſpel*) *Coloſſ.* 1. 23. could not be meant of the *Doctrin of Salvation by* Chriſt *Crucified*, with reſpect to that clear and bright

bright Diſpenſation the Apoſtles were under, but of that *Goſpel* which had been Preached to, or *in every Creature* under Heaven; and to prove his falſe notion of the Goſpel, that the Apoſtles Preached, that it was no other but the inward Principle, *i. e.* the Light within, in every Creature, he brings *Rom.* 1. 16. *Coloſſ.* 1. 23. *Rev.* 14. 6, 7. By all which it plainly appears, that ſeeing the Quakers, as both *G. Fox*, and *E. Burrough* hath declared are raiſed up (with Commiſſion from on high) to Preach the everlaſting Goſpel, as it is called, *Rev.* 14. 6, 7. The Goſpel which theſe Quakers have Preached, and do Preach, in his, and their Senſe, is not the Doctrin of Salvation, by the promiſed Meſſiah; Chriſt Crucified, and Raiſed again; but the common Light or Illumination in every Creature, or Man under Heaven, which he will have to be the only Signification of the Word, *Goſpel*, in all theſe three Places. Is it not therefore evident, that they hold it not neceſſary to their, and other Men's Salvation, to whom they Preach, to believe in Chriſt, as he outwardly Suffered Death, Roſe again, and Aſcended?

XXIII. Again, In his *Fig-Leaf*, p. 76 he Oppoſeth my Definition of a Chriſtian, Saying———Now hence I ask him; which is the moſt diſtinguiſhing Character of a Chriſtian, the *genus*, the inward Conformity to the Divine Word, or the *differentia*, ſome diſcriminating Token by an outward Belief and 'Conformity, *devoid of the inward Subjection of the Spirit*? [But in this he Aſſigns 'not my *differentia*, but a Falſe one of his own, *viz.* An outward Belief and 'Conformity, devoid of the inward Subjection of the Spirit. And this lets us ſee, 'that they make no account of the Faith of Chriſt, as he was outwardly Cru-'cified; why? it's *but an outward Belief and Conformity, devoid of the inward Sub-'jection of the Spirit*. But I plead for no ſuch Belief, and I know not any, called 'a Chriſtian that doth. And how Nonſenſical is he to ſay; that they who have 'both, have much the Advantage, is undenyable. Both what? the inward Con-'formity to the Divine Word, the *genus*, and the outward Belief and Conformi-'ty, devoid of the inward Subjection of the Spirit, as he himſelf there States it 'the *differentia*. But ſurely that's impoſſible, that any Perſon can have both; it's 'a plain Contradiction; and the very ſame ignorant Oppoſition, *T. Elwood* hath 'made to my Definition of *a Chriſtian*, in his Printed Anſwer to my firſt *Narra-'tive*, in his p. 75. whom the Author of *Satan Diſrob'd*, hath effectually Refuted, 'and ſhewed that according to *Thomas Elwood's Philoſophy*, a *Horſe* and *T. Elwood* 'differs very little, only in ſome outward Character; they agree in the Kind, and 'any other Difference is but Accidental. Thus their Prejudice and Oppoſition 'to Chriſtian Doctrin, ſo blinds them, that they may well be ſaid to be like the 'Horſe and the *Mule*, in the Caſe, that hath no Underſtanding; for all their 'high, but falſe Pretence to Divine Illumination above others, they are real-'ly become more Dark and Blind than others.]

XXIV. After all the foregoing Proofs, out of their ſeveral Great Authors; I ſhall bring ſome new Proofs on this Head, out of *George Fox*. [*Who as he was reckoned the firſt Teacher, and of greateſt Note among the Quakers; ſo he did moſtly lead them into theſe hurtful Errors; which, whatever his Pretences were, that he had his Doctrins from the inward Teachings of the Divine Light and Spirit; (to be ſure he had not his Errors therefrom) it is moſt probable, he had moſt, if not all of them from the Books of*

H. N.

H. N. *and other Familiſts, and ſome Ranters*; *as* Gerard Winſtanly, Richard Coppen, *and others, who had the like wild Notions before him*; *therefore* W. Penn *gave a wrong Character of him, to ſay,* he was no Copy, but an Original. *For the truth is, ſcarce any thing he Taught and Publiſhed, but it was to be found among others before him, both Ancient and Modern*; *and as for the Doctrin of the* Divine Teaching, and Internal Divine Illumination, and Internal Silence, and Turning in the Mind, to attend to the Divine Teachings; *Many* Myſtick Writers *have gone far before him, and more ſoundly and agreeably to the Holy Scriptures, have delivered theſe Matters*; *in which, as there is a great Truth, and unſpeakable Advantage, as well as an abſolute Neceſſity*; *that all true Chriſtians, be inwardly Taught of God, and Divinely Enlightned above Infidels*; *ſo unleſs great Care and Caution be uſed, both by the Publiſhers, and Receivers of that* Sublime Doctrin, *a great and woful Abuſe may be made of it, as is made by many at this Day, among the Quakers and others. And as Improper is that other part of the Character,* W. Penn *gives of him, in his Preface to* G. Fox's Journal, p. 31. *He was a Man that God endued with a clear and wonderful Depth, a Diſcerner of other Spirits.* p. 32. *He had an extraordinary Gift in opening the Scriptures, he would go to the Marrow of Things.* For this pretended Gift of Diſcerning, great Inſtances can be given how it manifeſtly failed him, *and what little true Knowledge he had in the Fundamentals of Chriſtian Doctrin, partly his own Sayings, hereafter to be quoted, and partly the Sayings of his Proſelytes, who may be ſuppoſed to have learned of him*; *will ſufficiently demonſtrate*] p. 250. In his *Great Myſtery of the Great* '*Whore*, Printed at *London*, 1659. He ſaith to *C. Wade*, 'And the Devil was in 'thee; and thou ſayſt thou art ſaved by Chriſt without thee, and ſo haſt Re- 'corded thy ſelf to be a Reprobate, and Ignorant of the '†Myſtery of Chriſt within thee; for without that 'thou doſt not know Salvation.

† *Note*, C. Wade, *in his Book*, Quakery Slain, *which I have ſeen, doth ſufficiently acknowledge Chriſt within*; *though he oppoſed the falſe Notion that* G. Fox *had of it.*

Again, p. 246. *Chriſtopher Wade*, having ſaid, it is Whimſical, to ſay, *Chriſt*, *God* and *Man*, *Fleſh* and *Spirit* is in them. *G. Fox* anſwers contrary to the Apoſtles Doctrin, who ſaid they were *of his Fleſh, and of his Bone.* Again, *C. Wade* having ſaid, Fleſh and Bone cannot be a Meaſure in one, and a Meaſure in another. *G. Fox* anſwereth, *ibidem.* Whereas the Apoſtle ſaith, *we are of his Fleſh, and of his Bone*; here thou art contrary to the Apoſtle, and that was more than one that had the Fleſh of Chriſt, and his Bone and Spirit. And p. 249. *C. Wade* had ſaid, there is not *whole Chriſt*, *God and Man in Men.* G. Fox, by way of Oppoſition, Anſwers; Then how muſt Men grow up in the *Meaſure of the Fulneſs of the Stature of Chriſt*? And p. 210. *And did not the Apoſtle* Paul *Preach Chriſt within, and you Preach Chriſt without?* Again, Page the ſame; and they ſay he is abſent from them, as touching his Fleſh. Anſwer, doth not the Apoſtle ſay, *that they are of his Fleſh, and of his Bone*; *and he that Eats not his Fleſh, hath not Life in him*; *and they ſit in Heavenly Places with him, and he that Eats his Fleſh, hath it within him.* Again, Page the ſame; They ſay that there is not any *Heaven within*, into which the Man Chriſt is Aſcended; or can any Man contain a Man four Foot long. *G. F.* Anſwers, *Chriſt* is a *Myſtery*; and is not he to be Revealed within, who is a Myſtery; he who did Aſcend to be Revealed, and made manifeſt in his Saints, in *Fleſh and Spirit* that did Diſcend. [*Note, what is this better, or more intelligible, than what the Popiſh Teachers ſay*; *that it is a Myſtery that* Chriſt, *Fleſh, and Spirit, God and Man is in the Hoſtie*] And thus I have gon through my Proofs on the firſt Head, as touching the Act of Faith. The next thing, to

be

be conſidered is the object of the Chriſtian Faith, *Chriſt* conſidered both as *God* and Man, and yet one *Chriſt*, is the great object of the Chriſtian Faith, together with the Father and the Holy Spirit, principally in-dwelling in *Chriſt*, and by and through him, in-dwelling in all true Believers: And this great object, to wit *Chriſt*, both with reſpect to his Godhead, and his Manhood, *G. Whitehead* hath moſt Wofully oppoſed.

Firſt, with reſpect to *Chriſt*'s Manhood, which he doth not allow to conſiſt of a Created Soul and Body.

George Whitehead in his Appendix to the Divinity of *Chriſt*, againſt *Thomas Danſon*, pag. 18. ſaith, As to *T. D.*'s telling of the Son of *God*'s Incarnation, the Creation of his Body and Soul, the parts of that Nature he ſubſiſted in, [*Note, that Nature plainly denotes* Chriſt's *Manhood Nature* that *T. D.* meant, which had a Created Body and Soul] To this I ſay, If the Body and Soul of the Son of *God* were both Created, doth not this render him a Fourth Perſon? for Creation was in Time. —— Again, where doth the Scripture ſay that his Soul was Created; for was not he the Brightneſs of his Fathers Glory, and the expreſs Image of his Divine Subſtance? and p. 18. —— And was not he a Perſon, as he was a Son of *Abraham*, not Fifty Years Old? If he was (as I never heard any yet deny,) and your Doctrin ſuppoſes a Trinity of diſtinct Perſons, as being Co-eternal, Co-equal, *&c.* doth not this then render *Chriſt*, as a Son of *Abraham*, to be a Fourth Perſon. [*Note how* T. Ellwood *would pervert* G. W.'s *words above quoted, to mean that* Chriſt, *as* God, *had not a created Soul and Body; whereas by both theſe Quotations it is plain* G. W. *did oppoſe* Chriſt *as Man, and as the Son of* Abraham *having a created Soul and Body.*]

Again, *Richard Hubberthorn*, a Man highly commended in print, by *G. F. E. Burrough*, and *G. Whitehead*, before his Collection, printed by the 2*d.* days Meeting, pag. 49. of the Collection ſaith, When was that *Chriſt* Created, which ye ſay muſt, as a Creature, Judge the World? And if in *Mary*'s time who was Judge of the World till then; or did he Judge the World as *God* till then, and as a Creature ever ſince? —— And when had the Man *Chriſt Jeſus* his beginning? If you can, declare it.

Stephen Criſp, a great Preacher and Writer among the Quakers, ſome years ago Deceaſed, hath the like paſſage pag. 194. Collection. He blamed *R. C.* for affirming that to be the Seed of Promiſe which came by Generation of, and from the Properties of Man in *Mary*; —— and where is thy Scripture to prove that *Jeſus* the Saviour was Created?

[*Note, all this paſſage* T. Ellwood *defendeth, and by no means will he allow* Chriſt *to be created as Man, for I had argued, if* Chriſt *be not created, as he came of* Abraham, *he is not Man: he retorted againſt my Argument thus,*] If Created, therefore not *God*; In his *Truth Defended*, p. 139. This his Retorſion he ſtill juſtifies in his Anſwer to my 1*ſt.* Narrative pag. 227. adding further, ſo far as he makes *Chriſt* to be Created, ſo far he makes him a mere Creature. [*This is a ſilly Sophiſm, as* God *he is not created, but as Man he is; for how could he dye and not be created? But he hath here diſcloſed the Secrecy,* Chriſt *is only* God, *and the Man is not* Chriſt, *but* Chriſt *who is* God, *did take the Man of the Virgin, and ſo the Man is one thing, and* Chriſt *in the Man is another. See the paſſage in his own words pag.* 227.

And

And in *Truth Defended*, p. 139. he ſaith, Beſides did not *G. K.* tell us in his laſt Obſervation, that *Chriſt* was the Son of *God* by an Eternal Generation, and the Son of *Abraham* by Generation in the Fulneſs of time? So that in each Reſpect, and under each Denomination, he is by Generation; and would he have him be Created alſo, only that he might render him a mere Socinian * Creature? herein not *S. Criſp*, but *G. K.* is Condemnable.

George Whitehead in his Book called, *The Nature of Chriſtianity*, p. 41. And that he Exiſteth outwardly, bodily without us at *God's* Right Hand, what Scripture proof hath he for theſe words? And then, what and where is *God's* Right Hand; is it viſible or inviſible, within us, or without us only? And is *Chriſt* the Saviour, as an outward bodily Exiſtence or Perſon without us diſtinct from *God*, and on that conſideration to be Worſhiped as *God*, yea, or nay? And where doth the Scripture ſay he is outwardly and bodily Glorified at *God's* Right Hand? Do theſe terms expreſs the Glory that he had with the Father before the World began, in which he is now Glorified?

Again, *G. Whitehead* in *The He-goat's Horn broken*, brings in *John Horne* and *Thomas Moor* his Antagoniſts ſaying, *Chriſt* took upon him our Nature, not as it is filthy in us by Sin in it. To this G. W. oppoſeth and ſaith, —— For here they cannot diſcern between the ſinful Nature and the pure Nature, for the Nature of *Chriſt* is pure; ſo that it's not their Nature, for their Nature is filthy, and therefore it is not in *Chriſt*. [*Here doth he not make Sin to be Eſſential to Mens Nature? That becauſe our Nature hath been defiled with Sin, therefore* Chriſt *hath not our Nature, nor ever had it.*

Like to this is a paſſage in *E. Burrough's* Coll. p. 306. he brings *J. Bunion* ſaying, that *Chriſt* aſcended into Heaven in our Nature, on which true words he thus gloſſeth, put in another Letter, *viz. In his Nature, and they that are one with him*, and he and they are proved to be in corrupt Nature, as they will confeſs it: O what wickedneſs to hold forth (ſaith *E. B.*) that *Chriſt* is at the Right Hand of *God* in ſinful Nature, as his words hold forth from his own Mouth. [*This is a moſt impudent perverſion of* J. B.'s *true words: He did not ſay ſinful Nature, but our Nature, which as* John Horne (*as above*) *did well diſtinguiſh, though ſinful in other Men, yet not in* Chriſt, *here they both contradict the* 4 *Art. Ch.* Eng.]

Fr. Howgil Lament. p. 19. —— And ſo while you have hope in any thing without you, you ſtand in that which is imperfect. And p. 20. Faith is the Life of this Birth, which is juſt; and the Son of *God* lives by it, who doth the Will of *God*, as it is written, the Life that I now live is by the Faith of the Son of God. [*Note this groſs Perverſion of* Paul's *words*, Gal. 2. 20.]

Secondly, G. *Whitehead* hath likewiſe oppoſed the Godhead of *Chriſt*, in his *Light and Life*, p. 24. he ſaith, To tell of the Word *God* Co-creator with the Father,

* *Here Note, can there be any more plain and evident proof, that according to* T. E. *and* G. W. *and the ſecond Days Meeting?* Chriſt *as Man, according to his Generation, in time in the Womb of the Virgin, as the Son of* Abraham *was not created. His Argument is vain,* he was by Generation, therefore not created as he was the Son of *Abraham; that* Chriſt *had a miraculous Generation in the Womb of the Virgin, is no Proof that he had not a created* Soul *and* Body.

Father, is all one; as to tell of God, being Co-creator with God; if the Father be God, and this is to make two Gods, two Creators, *&c.* For God, Co-creator with God, implies two. Thus Non-ſenſe, Confuſion, and Blaſphemy is heapt up againſt the Light within, *&c.*

Again, in p. 47 of the ſame, he quoteth the Baptiſt Saying. Now as he, (*viz.* Chriſt) was God, he was Co-creator with the Father, and ſo was before *Abraham*, and had Glory with God before the World was; and in this Senſe came down from Heaven. To this *G. Whitehead* replyeth; what Non-ſenſe and Unſcripture Language is this, to tell of God being * Co-creator with the Father; or that God had Glory with God? Does not this imply two Gods, and that God had a Father? Let the Reader Judge.

* *Here Note, As* G. W. *moſt Erroneouſly blames the ſaying, that the* Word God *was Co-creator with the Father*; (*the Participle* co *ſignifying* ſimul, *i. e.* joyntly, *or* together, *anſwering to the Greek Particle* σὺν) *as importing two* Gods; (*which is a Falſe and Socinian Conſequence*) *ſo he is guilty of two other great Errors againſt* Chriſt's *Godhead.* Firſt, *In blaming* W. B's *ſaying that the Word of* God *had Glory with* God, *before the World was.* Secondly, *In his blaming* W. B. *for ſaying, that the Word* God *had a Father*; *all theſe* 3 *Aſſertions of* G. W. *Firſt, That* Chriſt *the Word is not a Co-creator,* i. e. *a Creator joyntly, or together with the Father.* Secondly, *That he had not Glory with* God (*the Father*) *before the World was.* Thirdly, *That* Chriſt, *the Word* God *had not a Father: I appeal to all,* (*even the* Socinians *themſelves, if they will be*) *Impartial Men*; *whether they do not plainly oppoſe the Godhead of* Chriſt; *for indeed, by theſe very Arguments, the* Socinians *diſpute againſt his Godhead. Nor will* G. Whitehead, *nor yet his Moderate and Learned Church-man, their Evaſion excuſe* G. Whitehead, *his Groſs Error, in thus Oppoſing by* Socinian *Arguments, the Godhead of* Chriſt; *as if the Word Co-creator, did Import two Efficients of the Creation*; *one having a Created Power diſtinct from the other. As he brings his Church-man to his Defence, p.* 189, *of his* Antidote, *and p.* 188. *He Argueth, that Co-creator will import two diſtinct Agents, and ſo two Gods*; *but who told him ſo, or how doth he prove it? The contrary doth appear from the Septuagint*; *as I Noted in my ſecond Narrative, p.* 27. *Where the Eternal Wiſdom is brought in ſaying,* Prov. 8. 27, 31. συμπαρὼν *and* συντέλουσα, i. e. *I was Co-exiſtent, and Co-efficient. And his Moderate Church-man is Idle and Weak, in granting the Word Co-creating, and not Co-creator. But ſeeing his Moderate Church-man,* (Edmond Ellis) *hath but weakly Defended* G. W. *let us ſee what Defence* Th. Elwood *hath brought for him, in his Anſwer to my firſt Narrative, p.* 26. *He that ſays,* God, (*or* Chriſt *as* God) *was Co-creator*; *muſt intend he was Creator with himſelf, or Creator with another*; *to ſay,* God *was Creator, with, or together with* another; *is to imply two* Gods, *two Creators*; *which is that* G. Whitehead *called Unſcripture-like Language. See Reader, if this doth not prove both* G. Whitehead, *and* Tho. Elwood, *ſtill more Guilty of oppoſing* Chriſt's *Godhead, by* Socinian *and falſe Arguments.* Chriſt *is truly ſaid to be another, as well as the Holy Ghoſt is ſaid to be another,* John 14. 16. *Not in reſpect of the Godhead, but in reſpect of the Divine Relative Properties*; *whereby the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt are diſtinguiſhed*; *as the Property of the Father, is to beget, the Property of the Son, is to be Begotten of the Father, and the Property of the Holy Ghoſt is to proceed from the Father and the Son. But this Diſtinction of the Divine Relative Properties, betwixt the Father, and Son, and Holy Ghoſt,* G. Whitehead *hath down right oppoſed, in his Book, called,* Truth Defending the Quakers; *which he ſaith, is Written from the Spirit of Truth, Printed at* London, 1659. *p.* 2. *He ſaith, art thou ſo blind, as to think that there is ſuch a difference in the Godhead; ſeeing* Chriſt *is equal with his Father, who is a Spirit? then what incommunicable property can he differ in from the Father, that is not communicable to the one, as well as the other? Here note, He not only denyeth any Diſtinction of three Perſons, but alſo the Diſtinction of three Properties*; *which was the Sabellian Hereſie*; *who held only a Diſtinction in Name, or Manifeſtation*; *as* G. Whitehead *expreſly calleth them three in Manifeſtation*; *but will not allow any other Diſtinction, p.* 94, *of his Anſwer to* T. Danſon's Synopſis of Quakeriſm. *And* G. Fox *was Guilty of the ſame Error, in ſaying, it was contrary to Scripture*; *that* God *the Father never took upon him Human Nature.* Great Myſtery, *p.* 246. *This was the Error of the* Patripaſſians; *who ſaid,* God

the Father was Born of the Virgin, Suffered, Dyed, &c. Judge now Reader, whether G. Whitehead *hath not moſt Unchriſtianly, and Uncharitably accuſed me in his* Antidote, *p.* 192. *That I have wronged my own Conſcience, in this and ſome other things? But my Conſcience has received no wrong in any of theſe things, wherein I have charged him; for I have ſufficiently proved my Charges to be true againſt him. Nor doth it excuſe him, that he and* T. Elwood, *bring other Quotations to prove that* G. Whitehead *hath owned* Chriſt's *Godhead, or that* Chriſt *is* God. *For firſt, That only ſheweth and proveth, that* G. Whitehead *is Guilty of Contradicting himſelf; but* G. Whitehead *is accountable for his Contradictions, and not I.* Secondly, *How doth he own* Chriſt *to be* God? *Even juſt as I have ſhewn; not as having a Father, or as having Glory with* God *before the World was; but being the Father, as well as the Son, and Holy Ghoſt alſo; which was and is* Mugletoniſme, *and the old Sabellianiſm.*

The Proofs out of their Books on the Second Head.

That we are neither Juſtified, nor Sanctified by the Blood of Chriſt outwardly Shed.

G. Whitehead, in his *Light and Life,* p. 64. brings *W. B.* ſaying; you deny the Shedding of the Blood upon the Croſs. That was let out by Vertue of the Spear, being thruſt into his Side, to be Meritorious, or the Meritorious Cauſe of Man's Juſtification. To this he Replies: The † Shedding of that Blood, let out by the Spear, was an Act of a wicked Man, and the Spear an Inſtrument of Cruelty; which to lay the Meritorious Cauſe, or Streſs of Juſtification upon, is falſe Doctrin; for there is a great difference between Chriſt's offering up himſelf by the Eternal Spirit, a Lamb without Spot to God, and the Acts of wicked Men Inflicted upon him; as it's ſaid, by wicked Hands they put him to Death. [† *Note, though* J. Ives *gave the true Senſe of* W. B's *Words; that his meaning was* Chriſt's *Paſſion, and not the Act of wicked Men; yet he ſtill Oppoſed it as falſe Doctrin; that the Blood of* Chriſt *was Shed for the Remiſſion of our Sins; we have our Saviour's own Words; This Cup is the new Teſtament in my Blood, Shed for the Remiſſion of the Sins of many; and though the Souldier Shed it, yet it was* Chriſt *who gave it to be Shed.*] And whereas *J. Ives* propoſed the Queſtion thus, p. 64. But whether or no that Blood that was Shed upon the Croſs, was a Meritorious Cauſe of Juſtification. I am, (ſaid *J. Ives*) Juſtified and Purged by it. *G. W.* p. 65. would not Anſwer; but queried whether that Blood that purgeth, is ſtill in Being. But oft elſewhere throughout his Book oppoſeth it; As p. 7. *ad finem,* he quotes *W. B.* ſaying, the Blood Shed upon the Croſs, the Material Blood, Meritorious to Salvation, ſprinkles the Conſciences——Sanctifieth us——Juſtifies, Redeems.——But in Contradiction (*G. W.* ſays) (quoting *W. B.* his p. 40.) that Blood is not in Being. And then he ſaith, obſerve here a twofold Streſs is laid upon that Blood. Firſt, Merit to Salvation. Secondly, Work to Sanctification; and ſo he hath ſet it above God; for * God could not ſave, he (ſaith) ***and yet is not in Being;*** [*Groſs Abſurdity*] whereas Sanctification being a real Work inward, that is certain in being which effects it. [*Here* * *Note, that* G. W. *doth groſly Abuſe, and Miſ-repreſent* W. B. *he did not ſay,* God *could not ſave; for his Words are capit. princ. p.* 35. *as he* (viz. *Chriſt*) *was* God, *without being Man, or the Root, and not the Offſpring, he could not ſave Man.*

II. Again,

II. Again, *G. W.* p. 16. ſaith——But as for Juſtification, being laid one while upon the Name of Jeſus, another while upon the Shedding of that Blood without; another while by the Offering or Sacrifice upon the Croſs; *what Confuſion is here?* And how is this *Man* put to it to patch up his own Principles? ——But then (he ſaith) (p. the ſame) as to the Shedding of Chriſt's Blood without, which ſo much Streſs is laid upon, whoſe Work was that but of a wicked Man's, after he was put to Death? *and where is that Blood? Is it in Being, yea, or nay*, or did it ſink into the Ground and Corrupt, as ſome of you have confeſſed. And in p. 40. That Blood that was Shed is not in † Being, ſaith *W. B.* How then does it Cleanſe, Sanctifie, Juſtifie, Redeem, Save, *&c.* as he would have us believe? [† *Here Note, That theſe Words*, that Blood is not in Being; *were not Originally* W. B's, *but ſome other Perſons* (*probably Quakers*) *who uſe to talk at that rate of Argument*; *as appears in* p. 40. *But of late, ſaith* W. B. *I have frequently met with a Query, by way of* * *Cavillation*; *which is, whether that Blood ſpilt upon the Croſs, run not on the Ground, and ſo was ſwallowed up in the Ground? if ſo, then how can Man be juſtified by that which is not in Being?*]——After part of his Anſwer, he ſaith;——though that Blood Shed be not in Being; yet the Efficacy of that Blood is ſtill in Being, and it ſtill ſpeaks a freſh in God's Ears, and cries aloud for Mercy. [* *We ſee he calls it a Cavillation, and ſo indeed it is*; *for by the like Argument*, G. W. *may Argue.* Chriſt's *Death and Pains that he Suffered, are not in Being*; *therefore they are not of any Efficacy to our Reconciliation. But* G. W. *ſeeks moſt deceitfully to hide himſelf in his way of Arguing*; *as if he would caſt it by way of Reproach on* W. B. *that he held that* Material Blood *is not in* Being; *Querying his Oppoſite*; *where is that Blood, and whether is it in Being? But* G. W. *ſhould tell us whether it is in* Being; *which he has not done in all his Book*, viz. *Whether that Material and viſible Blood that was Shed, is in* Being? *But however, ſuppoſe theſe Words were Originally* W. B's. that Blood is not in Being; *from this* G. W. *draws a Conſequence. Now though the Antecedent were* W. Burnet's, *yet the Conſequence all along is* W. Whitehead's; *as in ſuch Caſes, when Diſputants Argue againſt their Antagoniſts*, ad hominem; *though the Antagoniſt furniſh him with a Conceſſion, which is the Antecedent of the Argument*; *yet the Conſequence is his who brings the Argument, and he is Accountable for it*; *for it was not* W. B. *that was oppoſing Juſtification, and Sanctification by* Chriſt's *Blood*; *for he was ſtrongly Affirming it*; *and to Refute what* W. B. *did Affirm*; G. W. *Argueth againſt him*; *that Blood is not in Being*; *therefore we are not Juſtified nor Sanctified by it.* W. B. *denyeth the Conſequence, and lets the Antecedent paſs, not poſitively determining it, (as I ſuppoſed) but rather leaving it, as uncertain to him*; *and I gueſs* G. W. *were he put to it to give a poſitive Anſwer, would be as uncertain to* W. B. *But* G. W.'s *Conſequence is Vain*; *for the Influence that* Chriſt's *Blood hath on Men for Juſtification*; *is not Phyſical, but Moral, and it had the ſame Influence on Men, from the beginning of the World, before it was Shed, or in Being, as ſince.*]

III. Again, *G. Whitehead, Light and Life*, p. 52. Argueth afreſh againſt Cleanſing and Juſtifying by the Blood outwardly Shed.——But whereas ſo much mention is made of the Blood Shedding, and ſo much Vertue and Efficacy ſeems to be derived from it. I ask; is it not a Spiritual, Supernatural Virtue, Power and Efficacy that Cleanſeth, Saveth, and Juſtifieth? if it be; how then doth it proceed from the *Shedding of the Blood outwardly*; (which Shedding by the Souldiers Spear, was a wicked Man's Act) or from the Eſſence of the Blood, if it periſhed, and be not in Being?

IV. Again, p. 55. He makes a new Perſuit againſt the Blood of Chriſt. ——And whereas we are accuſed with denying that Blood let out, to be any way Meritorious to Salvation. I ask, whether any thing is of Eternal Merit and Worth that is not Everlaſting? And where do the Scriptures uſe thoſe

Expreſſions, and ſo much vary about the Blood of Chriſt; as one while to ſay, that the Shedding that Blood outwardly, was the Meritorious Cauſe of Salvation; another while the word Shedding to be left out, and the ſtreſs laid only upon the Blood it ſelf, which the Souldier Shed, or let out of his Side with a Spear, which was *after he was put to Death*, John 19 33, 34. But then of what Effect were the Drops of Blood that fell from him in his Agony? Another while it is the Body that was Crucified, and not the Spirit within that ſaveth; for the Spirit, Light and Word within, is denyed to be the Saviour, by this our Adverſary, who does not know how to ſtate his own Faith and Principles.

V. Again, *G. W.* ſaith, p. 56. *Light and Life*; for we are not to ſuppoſe *two kinds of Saviours and Sanctifiers*, that is, both a Natural, (which is not in Being; as is ſaid of the Blood that was Shed) and the Spirit which ſtill liveth——I hope it will not be denyed, that this Work of Sanctification is wrought and fulfilled within by the Spirit, and that Sprinkling and Purging the Conſcience is inward, and then where *the Blood is ſaid to do it*, that muſt needs be Spiritual; for ſurely the *Blood Shed outwardly*, muſt needs have a Spiritual Signification, as well as the Water and the Croſs had; and the Apoſtle Attributes Waſhing or Sanctifying to Water, as well as to Blood.

VI. *G. Whitehead*, again, p. 56. It is confeſſed, that God by his own Blood purchaſed to himſelf a Church, *Acts* 20. 28. Now the Blood of God, or that Blood that relates to God muſt needs be Spiritual, he being a Spirit, and the Covenant of God *is inward and Spiritual, and ſo is the Blood of it.* But our Oppoſer confeſſeth, he is as ignorant of any ſuch Blood as may be; and indeed ſo is he like to be, while he ſets himſelf to contend againſt the *very Myſtery of God*, and againſt plain Scripture, *Acts* 20. 28. *Zech.* 9. 11.

[* *Here Note, That whereas* G. W. *hath affirmed, that we are not to ſuppoſe two kinds of Saviours and Sanctifiers; he means two kinds of* Bloods, *by which we are Saved and Sanctified; the one* Natural and outward, or Material, *the other* Spiritual and inward, *by which he means the Spirit. It is plain, he wholly denies both Juſtification and Sanctification, by the Material and outward Blood; becauſe he Argueth, there are* not two Saviours and Sanctifiers; *he means two things there are not, by which we are Saved and Sanctified; if by the Spirit within, then not by the Blood without. But his Arguing is vain, and beſpeaks his great Ignorance in Goſpel Truth; (for all his high Pretences to Divine Illuminations) we are Sanctified by the Blood of* Chriſt *outwardly Shed, as the meritorious procuring Cauſe of our Sanctification, and by the Spirit of* Chriſt *inwardly, as the immediate efficient Cauſe of it, How ignorant is he, not to underſtand that divers Cauſes do concur to produce one Effect, differing in kind and manner of Cauſality? But in contradiction to what he has ſaid above; that we are not to ſuppoſe two kinds of Saviours and Sanctifiers; he hath ſaid in his* Antidote. *p.* 220. *I conceive I am not to be blamed, much leſs Ranked among Ranters (as* G. K.'s Narrative, p. 25.) *for aſcribing the ſaving Work of Sprinkling the Conſcience, Sanctifying and Juſtifying* Principally *to the inward Grace and Spirit, more than to the Blood Shed upon the Croſs. For by the former Citations it appears he Argued wholly againſt either, Juſtifying or Sanctifying by the outward Blood; becauſe it was not in* Being, *and the Shedding of it was a wicked Man's Act. Again, That he pretends now to aſcribe Men's Sanctifying and Juſtifying principally to the inward Grace and Spirit, more than to the Blood Shed upon the Croſs. Here he moſt ignorantly compares Cauſes of differing kinds, attributing more to the one, than to the other; which ought not to be done, when the Cauſality is quite of a different kind, as it is here. For* Chriſt *by his Blood, Death and Sufferings, and moſt Holy and Perfect Obedience, all comprehended as the Meritorious Cauſe of Men's Juſtification; is as great a Cauſe in its kind, as the Efficient is, to wit, the Spirit or Grace in its kind; both being highly neceſſary in diverſe Reſpects.*]

VII.

VII. Again, *Light and Life*, p. 59. he ſaith †The Spirit of Chriſt (which is Life) doth both Quicken, Sanctifie and Juſtifie the true Believers, *John 6. 63. 1 Cor. 6.* And that Blood and Water that's ſaid to Cleanſe, is not of another kind, but agrees in one with the Spirit; *all which is* known, within, and the Effects thereof. [† *Here Note, He will not have two Bloods to Sanctifie and Juſtifie the one without the other,* (viz. *the Spirit*) *within the Blood and Water, and Spirit are not of two kinds, but one, and all within, and the Effects thereof; therefore how Diſingenuous is* G. W. *now in his* Antidote; *to allow Sanctifying and Cleanſing to two Bloods, or Bloods of two kinds; the one outward viſible material Blood, the other inward and Spiritual* Blood, *which is the Spirit; though to this laſt principally, more than to the other,* viz. *the outward Blood Shed upon the Croſs. But till he Retract the former Error, how can we believe him Sincere in the latter. Is it poſſible that a Man can believe contradictory Articles of Faith?*]

VIII. Again, Page the ſame, *G. W.* brings *W. B.* ſaying, All things under the Law in the Type were Purged with Blood, and this Blood was Material, and not Myſtical; and that Blood that Chriſt Shed, in order to the effecting the Salvation of Man, muſt needs be viſible and material Blood. To this *G. W.* oppoſeth, and puts a perverſe Gloſs on his Words;——but he adds, To ſay that Material Blood was * a Type of that which was Material; this is to give the Subſtance no Preheminence above the Type; (eſpecially if neither of them be Myſtical, nor in Being) or like, as if one ſhould ſay one Type was a Type of another. [* *Here* G. W. *plainly makes the Material Blood of* Chriſt *a Type, as well as the Material Blood of the Beaſts was a Type; and though he labours much in his* Antidote *to defend himſelf; that he made not the outward and material Blood of* Chriſt *a Type, by Reciting a great many Words to no purpoſe, out of his* Light and Life; *yet that Paſſage he altogether omits where the Pinch and Streſs againſt him lay; to ſay that Material Blood was a Type of that which was Material; this* (ſaid he) *is to give the Subſtance no Preheminence above the Type;*——*or like as if one ſhould ſay, one Type was a Type of another. Now this other Type, he will have it to be the Material Blood of* Chriſt, *of which the Material Blood of the Beaſts could not be a Type; and he abuſeth* W. B.*'s Words, by drawing a wrong Inference from them; though now at laſt* G. W. *in Contradiction to himſelf, grants,* viz. *The Types and Shadows under the Law, did both point at what was* Material, *and what was Myſtical in Chriſt.* Antidote, p. 226. *But ſtill he is in a groſs Error, to Teach that the Spirit of* Chriſt *in Men is any Blood of a Sacrifice, to make a continually repeated Ranſom and Satisfaction to the Juſtice of* God *for Men's Sins; and that the Blood of the Beaſts was a Type of any ſuch thing. Which falſe Notion of his is ſo Anti-chriſtian, that as he now purſues it in his* Antidote, *p. 232. p. 233. p. 234. 235. He makes* Chriſt's *offering himſelf up in Men a Sacrifice, millions of times repeated, as oft as Men Sin; and as many times as there are Men, in whom he is ſo offered, a greater and more principal Cauſe of their Juſtification, and Sanctification, and Salvation; than the Sacrifice of himſelf that he offered upon the Croſs; which as it moſt expreſly contradicts the Scripture, That mentions* Chriſt *once to have been offered up for all; ſo it cannot but be greatly offenſive to Chriſtian Ears; and is as Unſcriptural and Irrational, as the Papiſts Invention of the Sacrifice of the Maſs. And the like Diſingenuity* Tho. Elwood *ſheweth in his labouring to defend* G. Whitehead *in this Point, from p. 119, to 123. Anſwer to* Narrative. *Only that I find he repeats thoſe Words* G. W. *omitted, but ſeeks to turn them quite another way; as if* G. W. *perhaps might give a Nip to thoſe who held Circumciſion to have been a Type of* Water-Baptiſm, *p. 123. But this is a miſerable Shift for the Queſtion Stated in Terms was, whether the Material Blood of the Beaſts was a Type of the Material Blood of* Chriſt. W. B. *affirms it,* G. W. *oppoſeth it by this Argument; this were to make one Type a Type of another; ſo that it is plain he held the Material Blood of* Chriſt *to be the other Type.*]

I add to theſe Proofs from *G. W.* his defending *S. E.* The Blood let out by the Spear, after Chriſt was Dead, was no more than the Blood of another Saint; and ſeeing *T. Elwood* doth earneſtly argue that it was not Shed to compleat the Offering, becauſe he was Dead before it was Shed; it ſtill appears,

that

that to them it was of no more value than the Blood of another Saint; though *G. W.* at laſt in his *Antidote*, ſaith, p. 224. He diſowns the ſaid Compariſon of the Blood of Chriſt with that of another Saint, and believes *S.E.* was not in the Counſel and Wiſdom of God therein. But was *G. W.* in the Counſel and Wiſdom of God, when he ſo defended that blaſphemous Expreſſion; and poſitively ſaid, he did not judge it to be Blaſphemy? p. 58. *Light and Life.* And yet this is no Reflection on *G. W.*'s Infallibility.

And becauſe *G.* W. ſeems ſo earneſt now to defend himſelf, from having made the blood of Chriſt outwardly ſhed, a Figure or Type; Let us hear him once more, in a Book of his, called, *Truth Defending the Quakers*, Printed at *London*, 1659. To that Queſtion, Did *Richard Hubberthorne* well, in Writing that Chriſt's coming in the Fleſh was but a Figure? He anſwereth to him that made the Query. *Anſ.* Could Chriſt have been ſaid to have been Transfigured, if his coming in the Fleſh had not been a Figure or Example, till his Glory was Revealed? And haſt thou not read that he was the expreſs Figure of his Father's *Subſtance*; inſtead of which it is Tranſlated, he is the expreſs Image? '[Not to notice at preſent the great Impertinency and Perverſion, uſed by *G. Whitehead*, to juſtifie *R. H.*'s blaſphemous Aſſertion; theſe Words of *G. Whitehead*, plainly prove that he held Chriſt without to be a Figure; which is equivalent with Type, and but a Figure; unleſs it be ſaid he defended *R. H.* contrary to his own belief; and then where was his Sincerity?

But again, Seeing both *G. W.* and *Tho. Elwood* will needs have it that *G. W.* owned Redemption, and Cleanſing to *Chriſt*'s material Blood, though not principally to it, but to the ſpiritual Blood of *Chriſt* in *G. W.* himſelf and his Brethren, as being a more excellent Sacrifice, and a more principal cauſe of Salvation, as he hath now diſtinguiſhed. Let us again hear him; in his *Truth Defended*, p. 66. he brings *C. Wade* ſaying, That the Lord hath bought us, and Redeemed us with the Precious Blood of his Humanity, and ſaith, your imagined *Chriſt*, being a mere Spirit, never had any Humane Blood to Redeem you with; and to prove it, he brings 1 *Pet.* 1. 19. To this G. W. Anſwers; That Scripture haſt thou perverted, 1 *Pet.* 1. as thou haſt done other Scriptures to thy own Deſtruction; for there he witneſſed to the Blood of the Lamb which Redeemed them from their vain Converſation, but doth not tell them of Humane Blood to Redeem them with, for that which is Humane is Earthly, but *Chriſt* whoſe Blood is Spiritual, is Lord from Heaven; and he is not an imagined Spirit, but a true Spirit. And what ſay'ſt thou to this? Was that Humane Blood which *Chriſt* ſaith, except a Man drink, he hath no Life in him, and which cleanſed the Saints from all Sin, who were Fleſh of his Fleſh, and Bone of his Bone? [*Note*, G. W. *here plainly charges it to be a Perverſion, to underſtand Blood*, 1 Pet. 1. 19. *to be Humane Blood, and that by Humane he means Earthly, he tells us, and is not Earthly and Material of the ſame ſignification. Now ſince* G. W. *grants of late, as in his* Antidote, *that Men are Sanctified and Redeemed, in part, by the Material Blood of* Chriſt, *though not principally, how comes he to fall into the like Perverſion of that Scripture as he judged it? But if it be no Perverſion, becauſe he now owns that material blood is there*

to

to be underſtood, did he not father a lye upon the Spirit of Truth, to ſay, he writ this Untruth from the Spirit of Truth? And now let him Anſwer his own Objection, Peter *doth not tell of humane blood; why, nor doth he tell of material blood, which now* G. W. *owns to be meant, at leaſt in part, to belong to* Chriſt's *Sacrifice.* G. Whitehead's Chriſtian Quaker, p. 243, 244. *compare with* Truth Defended p. 66. *We really own and confeſs to the Blood of* Chriſt, *both in the Hiſtory and Myſtery.*

IX. *William Baily*, a great Preacher formerly among the Quakers, whoſe Works, after his Deceaſe, they have Collected and Printed, giving him great Commendations; In his Treatiſe called, *A Teſtimony of the Light in me from my Childhood*, p. 22. But he is the ſame that Redeemed Man by his Blood (the Life) out of the Earth. And p. 23. Others of them (*viz.* the Baptiſts) (among whom he ſaith he formerly went) with envious words ſtrived to get me back from them, telling me that I was fallen from Grace, and was become under the Law, and making the Blood of *Chriſt* of none effect, but I not knowing then the Blood to be the Life, and that the Life is the Light of Men, though I was convinced in my Conſcience of the Eternal Truth.

X. Again, p. 577. to the Queſtion: Do you Quakers own that Blood which was ſhed without the Gates of *Jeruſalem* upon the Croſs? Do you own Juſtification by that *B*lood which was viſible? He Anſwers p. 578. As for the words viſible *B*lood, and viſible Man, which thou ſo much talkeſt of, in this kind, they are Terms quite beſide the Language of the Scriptures of Truth, or elſe I am very Ignorant of ſuch tranſlations. Again, having cited *Joh.* 6. 53. he ſaith, Theſe words of truth we own, and witneſs, but your word Viſible Fleſh, and Viſible *B*lood, which ye would ſtrain us up to expreſs, to anſwer your wills and dark imaginations, we do not read from *Chriſt*, nor his Apoſtles in all the Scriptures.

XI. *Stephen Criſp*, another great Preacher, whoſe Works they have Collected and Printed ſince his Deceaſe, 1694. p. 160. ſaith, In his Treatiſe called, *The plain Path-way*, &c. And this Light in thee, wherewith thou art enlightened, is the Life of *Jeſus*, *John.* 1. 4. which he hath given a Ranſom for Man, and that was not natural, as ſome fooliſhly imagine; for if it were natural, it could not be a Ranſom for Man out of Sin.

XII. Again, in his *Back ſlider Reproved* (p. 192. Collect.) ſaith, and then again concerning the *B*lood that ſaves and does away Sin, hear what *R. C.* ſaith in his 11 pag. My *B*rethren, ye are *B*ought with a Price, not of *B*lood of *B*ulls and Goats, nor Heifers of a year old, but by the *B*lood of *God*. But in his 13 pag. he is of another Opinion, and ſaith quite contrary, theſe are his Words, *viz.* Which *B*lood being the *B*lood of his Humanity, as he was Creature, was that which did with *God* expiate for Sin; ſo now which of *theſe two Doctrins ſhall we believe*? [*Note, he makes them two inconſiſtent Doctrins*] that we are ſaved by, the Blood of *God*, or Blood of the Humanity, or ſhall we ſuppoſe them to be both one, and ſo *God* to be Humane, and the Doctrins indifferent? *R. C.* will do well to clear up theſe things, or own his Condemnation upon his Folly and Preſumption.

XIII.

XIII. *W. Penn* in his *Rejoynder* to *John Faldo*, pag. 284. Juſtifieth *Will. Smith's* ſaying, *Chriſt* in us offereth himſelf a Living Sacrifice to *God* for us, by which the Wrath of *God* is appeaſed to us, and not only ſo, but laboureth to confirm them, p. 285. ſaying, that *Chriſt* offers himſelf in his Children, in the Nature of a Mediating Sacrifice, and that *Chriſt* is a Mediator, and an Attoner in the Conſciences of his People, at what time they ſhall fall under any miſcarriage if they unfeignedly Repent, according to 1 *John* 2. 1, 2.

XIV. And to the ſame effect, but more fully, *G. Whitehead*, in his *Light and Life of Chriſt within*, p. 44. I ſhall recite the whole paſſage, though it be long, for its ſervice, to ſhew what a fictitious Satisfaction and Sacrifice he hath ſet up of the Light within Men, after he hath oppoſed the Satisfaction and Efficacy of *Chriſt's* Sacrifice without us.

As to that (ſaith G. W.) againſt W. *Smith*, in the 31 p. touching *Chriſt* in us offering up himſelf a living Sacrifice, to that W. *Burnet* ſays, Then in vain did our Dear Lord ſuffer that Curſed Death upon the Croſs. *Rep.* That's a falſe Inference; for his fulfilling the Righteouſneſs of the Law within does not make void his aboliſhing, and taking away the ſhadows of the Law without, but rather brings to know the Effect of his Obedience and Suffering, and the Teſtimony thereof to be fulfilled within; as alſo his Offering is of further extent, than that of the outward; for he made his Soul an Offering for Sin: *And he is the propitiation, not for our ſins only, but for the ſins of the whole world.* Mark, *He is the propitiation* in the preſent time: And ſeeing there remained no more a Sacrifice for them that willfully ſinned, therefore there does remain a Sacrifice for them that do not wilfully ſin, the true knowledge and living ſenſe of which (as *Chriſt* does fulfil the Law inwardly) appeaſeth the Wrath and Condemnation of it, and raiſes hope in that Soul, that has known and lain under the ſentence of Death within it ſelf. And did not the Apoſtle bear in his Body the dying of the Lord Jeſus? and did not he ſay, I fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of *Chriſt* in my Fleſh, for his Body's ſake, which is the Church? *Col.* 1. 24. Mark, That which is behind of his afflictions; ſo then all was not ended on the Croſs. And had not they an Altar to Eat at, in the Heavenly Sanctuary? And could this be without an Offering or Sacrifice to Eat of? Or do any eat his Fleſh and drink his Blood, who do not partake of this Altar of him, as a Sacrifice, or the one Offering which ended the many?

XV. Again, concerning *Chriſt's* Fleſh within being the Offering, and how ſlain, *&c.* Hear their great Apoſtle *G. F.* in a Printed Treatiſe called, *Several Papers given forth for the ſpreading of Truth*, Printed in the Year 1671. one of them bearing this Title, concerning *Chriſt's* Fleſh which was Offered, *&c.* p. 54. *Chriſt* the Lamb ſlain from the Foundation of the World, when it began its Foundation, then the Lamb was ſlain, then the World was ſet up in Man's Heart, that he did not ſee the beginning nor the ending of the Works of *God*; and then *Adam* and *Eve's* clean Fleſh was defiled, and clean Bodies and clean Minds, when they tranſgreſſed, and tranſgreſſions entred, ſo came Sin

Sin into *Adam* and *Eve*; and then the Body of Death made up in the Sin and Tranſgreſſion in *Adam's* Fleſh and *Eve's*; then were their Minds defiled, and their Spirits and their Souls came into Death, and their Fleſh defiled; then came their Underſtandings to be darkned, and *Chriſt* according *to the Fleſh* Crucified, the Lamb ſlain, that Fleſh of his which is a Myſtery, when the Firſt *Adam* and *Eve's* Fleſh was defiled, and ſo Death reigned from *Adam* to *Moſes*, *&c.* And when the Jews did tranſgreſs the Law of *God*, the Prophets told them, they oppreſſed the Seed, as a Cart with ſheaves; and likewiſe the Prophets did ſee *Chriſt*, which had been ſlain from the Foundation of the World, and bruiſed, which, *Moſes David*, *Abraham*, and the reſt of the Prophets ſaw; that he was to Riſe, that *God* would raiſe him up, who ſhould come in the end of the Book, that is, in the end of the Words, in the end of the Prophets, in the end of the Types, Figures, and Shadows, pag. 56. So the *Belief* comes into this Righteouſneſs, *Chriſt* the Seed; for the other Righteouſneſs was held in the clean Part, in which was the Offering; ſo he ends and puts down that Righteouſneſs, who is the Righteouſneſs, and that Part, and Eye, and Mind that ſtands in it, that they may come to a *Thing* that's *lower*, and *under*, and *higher*, and *over* all, and before all, that is, the Righteouſneſs it ſelf; ſo in this lies the belief: So then in the Life, and in the Subſtance, and in the end of all Types, p. 57. So through this Fleſh he doth Reconcile, and by the Offering up his Body, his Fleſh, that which hath been ſlain from the Foundation of the World, and yet never corrupted; —— Which Fleſh is the Offering; for, as he was *God*, he did not dye, and this Fleſh is a Myſtery, and in this Fleſh is the *Belief* that takes *away the Sin*, that never corrupted, that is, the Offering for Sin, and the Blood of this Fleſh cleanſeth from Sin, p. 58. Now they that are in the belief of this Fleſh, and Offering, ſee over all Offerings, to the beginning into the Glory which was with the Father, before the World began: For, *all outward* Offerings and Sacrifices were given to Man after he fell, and the Lamb ſlain, which Offering is a Figure of *Chriſt*, the Seed to be brought forth and offered up, and he, the Top-ſtone, over all laid, to end and finiſh all the outward Offerings, and Types, and Shadows, and in him there is none, p. 59. —— So through this Offering is the Reconciliation, through the Offering of his Fleſh, that never corrupted, but takes away corruptions, and his Blood cleanſeth from corruptions, the *Life* read; and ſo this pure Fleſh, this Offering is ſet over all, which never corrupted, which muſt be your Meat if you live, though there is more in all theſe things which is hard to be uttered, and cannot be uttered yet.

Again, *G. Fox*, in the Book called *Saul's Errant to Damaſcus*, Printed 1653. p. 8. ſaith, —— And he that hath the Son, hath Life, and he that hath not the Son, hath not Life; and he that hath the ſame Spirit that raiſed up *Jeſus Chriſt is equal with God*; and the Scripture ſaith, that *God* will dwell in Man, and walk in Man. As *Jeſus Chriſt* which is the Myſtery hath paſſed before,

ſo the ſame Spirit takes upon it the *ſame Seed*, and is the ſame where it is made manifeſt.

XVI. Again, *G. Fox*, In his Treatiſe called, *Several Papers given forth*, &c. p. 47. Now, to all Dear Ones, and Dear Hearts I ſpeak, The *ſame Seed*, which is *Chriſt*, the ſame Spirit takes upon it now as ever; ——And the *ſame Seed* paſſing into the Wilderneſs, and there is tempted to Luſt after the Creature; you that are in the Wilderneſs witneſs this with me, and the ſame Temptations even to deſpair, and make themſelves away. Q. *How is this applicable to* Chriſt *within*? *Can* Chriſt *within be tempted to Luſt or Deſpair*?

XVII. Again, In the Book called, *Some Principles of the Elect People of God*, p. 20. *G.* ſaith, Our Church is in *God*, the Father of our Lord *Jeſus Chriſt*, which he Redeems with his own Blood, without ſpot or wrinkle, or deformity, or any ſuch thing; which Blood we feel in our Hearts, Purging us from all ſin; with which Blood we feel our Conſciences cleanſed from dead Works to ſerve the Living *God*; ſo this Blood is witneſſed in us, and the excellency thereof, by which we come to know the force of Redemption.

The Proofs out of their Books on the Third Head. That there is not a Reſurrection of the Body that Dyeth.

I. W. *Penn*, in his *Reaſon againſt Railing*. p. 137. brings *Thomas Hicks*, arguing for the Reſurrection of the Body; *the Joys of Heaven Imperfect elſe*. To this W. *Penn* oppoſeth, ſaying. I anſwer. Is the Joy of the Ancients now in Glory Imperfect; or are they in Heaven but by halves? If this be ſo unequitable, that the Body which hath Suffered, ſhould not partake of the Joys Celeſtial; Is it not in meaſure unequal, that the Soul ſhould be Rewarded ſo long before the Body? This Principle brings to the Mortality of the Soul, (held by many Baptiſts) or I am miſtaken. But why muſt the Felicity of the Soul depend upon that of the *Body*? Is it not to make the Soul a kind of Widow; and ſo in a State of Mourning and Diſconſolateneſs; which State is but a better ſort of Purgatory?

II. And p. 134. He brings *T. Hicks* Reaſoning. If the *It* in the Text be not the ſame *Body*; how can that be called a Reſurrection? for that ſuppoſeth the ſame. I anſwer (ſaith W. *P.*) If a thing can yet be the ſame, and notwithſtanding changed; for ſhame let us never make ſuch a ſtir againſt the Doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation; for the Abſurdity of that is rather out-done than, equalled by this carnal Reſurrection.

III. And p. 136. He puts this Gloſs on the Words; *this Mortal ſhall put on Immortality*. Thus, That we who are Mortals, reſpecting our *Bodies*, put off the Mortal part, and put on inſtead thereof Immortality; ſuitable to that weighty Paſſage of the Apoſtle *Paul*, 2 *Cor.* 5. 1. *We know that if our Earthly Houſe*, &c. Which as directly (he ſaith) concludes the *Change, not of Accidents*; but

but *Bodies* from an Earthly Houſe or Tabernacle, to an Heavenly Houſe or *Building*; as even any thing can be ſpoke by Men or Angels.

IV. Again, p. 138. He argues thus againſt it. *Becauſe* that the Scripture ſpeaks of a Diſſolution, and *no Reſurrection* of that which is diſſolved, being Earthly, and unfit for a Celeſtial Paradice; and therefore holds forth a *Building* of God, an Houſe Eternal in the Heavens. *Secondly*, If the *Body* be the ſame, it muſt have the ſame Nature, otherwiſe not the ſame *Body*; but if it have the ſame Nature, it will be Corruptible ſtill. And p. 140. he ſaith, For our parts, a Reſurrection we believe, † and of *Bodies* too unto eternal Life.

[† *Note: But how, a* Reſurrection *of Bodies? which either they have already, or receive immediately after Death; but quite other Bodies, differing from the mortal Bodies they have, not in Accidents, but in Subſtance or Body; as* W. Penn *plainly hath affirmed.*]

V. Again, *W. Penn*, in his *Rejoynder*, p. 369. Giving his Gloſs upon 1 *Cor.* 15. 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49. I ſay this doth not concern the Reſurrection of carnal Bodies; but the two States of Men under the firſt and ſecond *Adam*. Men are ſown into the world *Natural*, and ſo are the Sons of the firſt *Adam*; but they are raiſed *Spiritually* through him who is the *Reſurrection and the Life*; *and ſo they are the Sons of the ſecond* Adam, *the Lord from Heaven, the quickning Spirit*. But perhaps it will be objected, that the 47*th* verſe, *The firſt Man is of the Earth, Earthly*; and part of the 9*th* verſe, *We ſhall alſo bear the Image of the Heavenly*, ſeem to *imply a bodily Reſurrection*; but let the whole Verſes be conſidered, and we ſhall find no ſuch thing.——Who ſees not, that this is rather ſpoken of the *earthly Mindedneſs, than the earthly Body of* Adam?

VI. *G. Whitehead*, in his *Chriſtian Quaker*, p. 353. Brings *T. Danſon*, ſaying; The Happineſs of the Soul is not perfect without the Body; its dear and beloved Companion, the Soul, having a ſtrong deſire and inclination to a Reunion to the Body; as the Schools not without ground determine. *Vide Calv.* To this *G. W.* Anſwers. Both *Calvin*, *T. Danſon*, the Schools, and divers Anabaptiſts are miſtaken in this very Matter, and ſee not with the Eye of true Faith; either that the Happineſs of the Soul is not perfect without the Body, or that the Soul hath a ſtrong deſire to a Re-union to the Body; while they intend the Terreſtrial Elementary Bodies; for this implies the Soul to be in a kind of Purgatory, or Diſquietneſs, till the ſuppoſed Reſumption of the *Body*.

VII. Again, *G.* in his *Light and Life*, p. 68. brings *M. Caſſin*, ſaying, I appeal to the Husbandmen and Farmers, who ſow Wheat, Rye, Peaſe, *&c.* How the ſame Grain, or ſort of Grain that they Sow doth ariſe, and grow up again. *G. Whitehead* Anſwers. I do appeal to the Husbandmen, whether the ſame Corn that is in the Ear of Wheat, Rye, *&c.* be the ſame that was Sown in the Ground.——For the Wheat, or other Grain that falls into the Earth dies, *as to the Subſtantial Part*. And further, there is a natural *Body*, and there is a ſpiritual *Body*; as there are *Bodies* Celeſtial, and *Bodies* Terreſtrial; the Sun, Moon and Stars are Celeſtial *Bodies*; but *Birds*, *Beaſts* and Fiſhes are Terreſtrial. Now you might reckon him a very blind and ignorant Man, that ſhould put no difference between theſe *Bodies* Celeſtial, and thoſe that are Terreſtrial; or that ſhould reckon the *Bodies* of Sun, Moon and Stars, and the

Bodies of *Birds*, *Beasts* and *Fishes*, to be all one in ***Matter and* * *Substance***; as *M. C.* hath done, concerning natural and spiritual *Bodies*. [* *Note here, How false Notions and Arguments destroy their Faith; as they declare themselves very Blind and Ignorant in the great Article of the Christian Faith, touching the Resurrection of the Body; so they declare their great Ignorance in true Philosophy of Bodies; as if a Body could not be changed from Earthly to Heavenly, and yet retain the same Substance. And seeing they contend that the Change is in* Substance; *it is a plain case they hold nothing of the Body that Dyeth, riseth again; for if the Substance be changed, the Body is every way, and in all respects another Body, as much as* James *is another Man than* John; *and by their Reasoning,* Christ *has not the same Body in Heaven he had on Earth; for they will grant he had a material and earthly Body; which by their false Philosophy cannot be a Heavenly Body.*]

VIII. Again, *G. Whitehead*, p. 67. *Light* and *Life* saith, But the † Resurrection, according to the Scriptures of Truth, and Testimonies of ***Christ***, and the Apostles, we do believe and own, as recorded in ***John* 5. 21, 24, 25, 28, 29. *Chap.* 11. 25. *Matth.* 22. 30, 31, 32. 1 *Cor.* 15. 34, 35, 36, 37, 38. *and so on*, 2 *Cor.* 5. 1.** Many other places might be cited. [† *Note, whereas* G. W. *quotes these several places to let us know what Resurrection the Quakers own, one of which places,* 1 Cor. 15. 37, 38 and so on; *which Words take in the following Verses, to v.* 50. W. Penn *hath told us in his* Rejoynder; *that let the whole Verses be considered, and we shall find no such thing, as to imply a bodily Resurrection, but a change from earthly Mindedness, to a renewed State to* God, *through the Operation of the Spirit. Thus we see how they deceive the unwary Readers, who would make them believe they own the Resurrection of the* Body, *according to Scriptnre, and yet mean nothing thereby, but Regeneration, or the new birth here in time, before the Death of the mortal Body. And seeing this is the Resurrection they own, and no other according to the Scriptures, Cited by* G. W. *one of them being* Matth 22, 30, 31, 32. *In the Resurrection they neither Marry, nor give in Marriage; do not they commit a hainous Crime, who Marry, and continue in a Married State, after they have got the Resurrection? Their* quondam *Brother,* Tho. Case, *acted more agreeably to his Principle, who Renounced his Wife after he reckoned he was come to the Resurrection; and whom I heard say, all Marriage was of the Devil; and many know that it was his Principle, and of them that followed him in* N. York *Province, and* Long Island, *and* New England.]

IX. Again, *G. Whitehehd, Light and Life*, p. 65. brings *Jer. Ives*, asking *G. W.* Answer, To the *Body* that was Crucified, whether it be in Heaven, yea, or nay. [To this *G. Whitehead* refuseth any positive Answer; which had he believed the truth of Christ's *Body* that was Crucified, being in Heaven, he would, and ought plainly to have answered as a sincere Christian; but instead of a plain Answer, he shifts,] and asks the Enquirer another Question. ***Is it in Heaven without the Blood in it?*** And when *M. C.* Answered, the *Blood* is in it, or with him in Heaven; he entred into the holy Place with *Blood*; he raiseth a new Quibble, by way of Query. ***What * holy Places, and with what Blood?*** [* *Here he seems as incredulous of the Existence of any Heaven without Men, as of any body of* Christ *in Heaven. And he yet further asks a Quibling Query; Is that blood that was shed outwardly in his body? Here let any Intelligent and Impartial Man, consider, whether all this Quibling and Querying, doth not plainly bespeak, that he had not the belief of* Christs body that was Crucified, its being in Heaven; *else why did he so much oppose these Men about it, that said they believed it, and would know his Faith about it? Yea, he grants that the* Principal Heads of Controversie *betwixt him and his Opposits in that Place. p. 65. were these. 1. Whether the blood that was shed upon the Cross, doth Justifie and Sanctifie? 2. Whether the body (of* Christ) *that was Crucified, was in Heaven, yea, or nay? Now seeing* M. C. *affirmed it, and* Jer. Ives *also; and* G. W. *owneth that these two things were the* Principal Heads *of the Controversie betwixt them and him; 'tis plain from his own Confession he denyed them both; which sufficiently prove him guilty of these two Heads, as well as the other Quotations brought by me, above-mentioned, prove the same.*]

X. ***Richard Hubberthorne***, a great Preacher among the Quakers, whose Works they have Collected, since his Decease, p. 121. col.——And these are they that

that plead for a Life in Sin, while they are here, and that ſay, that the Saints Glorified in Heaven, do yet hope for the *Reſurrection of their bodies*; and ſo not come to the end of their Hope, though in Heaven; when as the Saints upon Earth witneſſed the end of their Hope, the Salvation of their Souls. Now theſe may well deny *Perfection* on Earth, who deny it in *Heaven*; which the Saints, we, and the Scriptures do witneſs it in both; and againſt all ſuch who are not fit to ſpeak of the things of God.

XI. Again, In p. 119. And his Envy hath reached to Heaven, to prove that the Saints in Heaven are not Perfect, but wait for the *Redemption of their bodies*; which now, if People mind the Scripture, there is *no ſuch Doctrin in it*, as the Saints in Heaven, have not received *the Redemption of their bodies*.

XII. Again, p. 275. There is a very ſtrange Paſſage concerning the two Seeds, the Seed of the Woman, and the Seed of the Serpent; the Seeds (the faith) are but two in the whole World, having each Seed its own body, and in every one, until the one be caſt out; and that every one of theſe two Seeds in every Man ſhall ariſe in its own order; the one ſhall riſe unto everlaſting Life, and, the other unto Condemnation. ——Chriſt the Seed made his Grave in the Wicked, and in the Rich in his Death; and out of that Grave ſhall riſe with his body unto everlaſting Life. If thou canſt receive it, thou mayeſt be ſatisfied. [*Are not theſe Words horrid Perverſions of the Scriptures that Treat of the Reſurrection?*]

Proofs out of their Books on the Fourth Head.

That Chriſt is not to come without us, &c.

I. *G. Whitehead, Light and Life*, p. 40. 41.——And as to that, 1 *Theſſ.* 4. 17. Which W. *B.* brings to prove, *that Chriſt ſhall come in the latter end of the world from Heaven above the Clouds*. Now in *v.* 15. It's ſaid that We which are alive, and remain unto the coming of the Lord; now I ask if they did live and remain to a *Perſonal coming of Chriſt* in the Clouds, yea, or nay? Or can it be reaſonably thought to be a coming, that is not yet, that they lived and remained unto? And further, *John* in *Rev.* 1. *Said, behold he cometh with clouds, he alſo when he was in the Spirit ſaw him that was the firſt and the laſt, and in the midſt of the 7 golden Candleſticks, he ſaw one like unto the Son of Man*, &c. Now did *John* ſee him with carnal Eyes? Or was this coming ſuch *as you expect outwardly*? 'Moreover Chriſt ſaid, the Son of Man ſhall come 'in the Glory of his Father with his Angels, and then he ſhall reward eve-'ry Man according to his Work. Verily I ſay unto you, there be ſome 'ſtanding here which ſhall not taſt of Death, till they ſee the Son of 'Man coming in his Kingdom, *Matth.* 16. 27, 28. *Luke* 9. 26, 27. Now what is that Glory of the Father, in which his coming is? Is it viſible to the carnal Eye? And when was that coming to be? Is it now to be looked for *outwardly*? But farther, we do acknowledge the ſeveral comings of Chriſt according to the Scriptures, both that in the Fleſh, and that in

in the Spirit; which is manifeſt in ſeveral degrees, as there is a growing from Glory to Glory. But three comings of *Chriſt*, not only that in the Fleſh at *Jeruſalem*, and that in the Spirit, but alſo another coming in *the Fleſh* yet to be expected, we do not Read of, but a ſecond coming without ſin unto Salvation, which in the Apoſtles days was looked for. Again, That the Dead in *Chriſt* ſhall riſe firſt, we own to be an Effect of *Chriſt*'s coming; and know that there is a dying in *Chriſt*, a being Baptized into his Death, before a coming forth, or riſing in the likeneſs of his Reſurrection: *And if we be dead with him, we ſhall alſo live with him, 2 Tim. 2. 11.* And *Paul* to the *Coloſſians* ſaid, *For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Chriſt in God.* But now to prove theſe ſtates, what 'tis to dye with *Chriſt*, to be conformable unto his Death, and to partake of the Power of his Reſurrection; Theſe things are hid from that Eye, and Expectation, which is Carnal, and only known to them that are come to the Myſtery of Faith in a pure Conſcience, and to know that Power, by which the Faith of the Operation of *God* is known, and the Works and Effects of it. But at theſe things * blind and ignorant Contenders may Carp and Cavel till they be more blind, and plunged in groſs Darkneſs and Unbelief.

* *Here Note a few things,* 1. *That he calls them all blind and ignorant Contenders, who contend for this great Fundamental Article of Faith, that* Chriſt *ſhall come in the latter end of the World, from Heaven above the Clouds.* 2. *That he expounds all theſe Scriptures above mentioned, of* Chriſt's *inward coming in Spirit in the Hearts of Believers, contrary to the obvious ſenſe of the Scripture it ſelf, and contrary to the Univerſal ſenſe of all* Chriſtendom, *and all Chriſtian Writers both Ancient and Late; and if theſe Scriptures prove no coming of* Chriſt *from Heaven, outwardly, yet to be expected, where ſhall we find any other Scriptures to prove it? Surely no where.*

G. W. *is very diſ-ingenuous and unfair, by thinking to hide his groſs Error, in denying this Fundamental Article of Faith, by a Quotation he brings out of a Book of mine, called,* The Way caſt up, *p.* 131. *Where I had ſaid, That Body that was Crucified on the Croſs at* Jeruſalem, *and is now Aſcended and Glorified in Heaven, which remaineth the ſame in Subſtance that it was on Earth, although it be wonderfully changed as to the mode and manner of its being, its being no more a Body of Fleſh, Blood, and Bones, but a pure Ethereal or Heavenly Body, like unto which the Bodies of the Saints are to be at the Reſurrection; which I thus further explain in the following words, omitted by him: For, Earthly and Heavenly are not ſo differing, but that remaining one in Subſtance, they may be changed one into another: So that, as one and the ſame ſinful Soul may, by the Operation of the mighty Power of* God, *be changed, ſo as to be made Heavenly and Pure, even ſo, one and the ſame Earthly body, may, by the ſame Power, be made Heavenly; and thus, in different reſpects, they are one and the ſame, and yet not the ſame, one in Subſtance, and yet not one, but another, in the manner of being. But how doth this paſſage, even as quoted by him, (though not fully as now I have done) excuſe* G. W.'s *Arguing againſt* Chriſt's coming in the latter end of the World from Heaven above the Clouds, and againſt his Perſonal coming in the Clouds, *as I have ſhewed above, and as I have quoted him on the former Head, where he ſaith, you might reckon him a very blind and ignorant Man that ſhould reckon Natural and Spiritual, Earthly and Heavenly, or Terreſtrial and Celeſtial Bodies to be all one in Matter and Subſtance. Here he plainly denyeth, that a Terreſtrial Body, and a Celeſtial Body is all one in Matter and Subſtance, which (as he quotes me) I have affirmed, in my Book,* The Way caſt up, *Printed in the Year* 1677.

II. G. W. *ſaith, in his* Antidote, *pag.* 205. *In our former Controverſies on this Point, the Queſtion put to us, was not whether the Saints ſhall come forth in the Reſurrection, with their Bodies of ſuch a ſpiritual, pure, and heavenly Extract, as to be free from all Carnality, Groſneſs, Droſs, and Terreſtrial Qualities, even ſo, as no more to be Bodies of Fleſh, Blood and Bones, but pure Ethereal, or Heavenly Bodies, like unto* Chriſt's *Glorious Body, according to* G. K.'s *and his Advocates Confeſſion.*

Anſwer

Anſ. *If any of their* Opponents *held the Doctrin of the Reſurrection, of the Bodies of the Saints too Carnally and Groſly, was that, or is that an excuſe for* G. W. *and* W. Penn *to run into the other extreme? to deny the Reſurrection of the Body that dyeth altogether; and to affirm as they have done, that the body that dyeth, and the body that riſeth, are two differing bodies in Subſtance, as* James *and* John *are two differing Men? And not only ſo, but poſitively to affirm that the deceaſed Saints expect no Reſurrection of the Body. This certainly proves, they did not believe the Reſurrection of the Body that dyeth, in any caſe, how much ſoever changed from Carnality to Spirituality, ſeeing the Saints, at Death, get all they expect, otherwiſe, as both* W. Penn *and* G. Whitehead *have argued, they would be in a Purgatory for the time.* And to apply *G. Whitehead*'s diſ-ingenuous and new Coined diſtinction, where p. 205. *Antidote*, he confeſſeth, He and his Brethren have objected againſt the ſame Subſtance [*as touching the Reſurrection Body*] that is, ſaith he, the ſame *groſs Subſtance and Bodily Exiſtence*, of Fleſh, Blood and Bones, *This we have objected* againſt. The caſe about the ſame Subſtance of the Body that dyeth, and riſeth, as now ſtated in *Antidote*, p. 205. denyed and oppoſed by *J. P. Keith*, &c. p. 133. This will make him ſtill more impertinent in his former way of Oppoſition and Arguments, as where he ſaith, *Light and Life* p. 69. I do appeal to the Husbandmen, whether the ſame Corn that is in the Ear of Wheat, be the ſame that was Sown in the Ground —— For the Wheat, or other Grain that falls into the Earth, dies, *as to the ſubſtantial part of it.* Obſerve, he does not mention one tittle here of the groſneſs, but ſimply the ſubſtantial part: For the Queſtion put to appeal betwixt *G. W.* and his Opponent, was not whether the grain of Wheat riſeth in his groſneſs, or in all its groſs parts, that it had when Sown; it had been very ridiculous to have diſputed that, or appealed to Husbandmen to decide it; becauſe every body knoweth the contrary. And as ridiculous would his new diſtinction be to that paſſage, where he reckons them very blind and ignorant, ſuch as *M. Caffin* is, who ſhould put no difference betwixt Bodies Celeſtial and Terreſtrial, but to be all one in Matter and Subſtance. *Now, ſeeing neither* M. Caffin *nor other Perſon, hath been Inſtanced by* G. W. *nor, I preſume, can be Inſtanced by him, that ſaith Bodies Celeſtial are the ſame groſs Subſtance, having the ſame groſneſs that Terreſtrial Bodies have; therefore this new diſtinction of his is wholly impertinent, and ſufficiently demonſtrates* G. W's *diſ-ingenuity, that inſtead of acknowledging his Error, in a fundamental Doctrin (leſt the Quakers conceipt of his Infallibility ſhould fall) goeth about to hide himſelf at ſuch a Rate, that if this Rate of Liberty be allowed, the vileſt of Errors may be defended. And as impertinent is he to me, in his complaining againſt me, again, and again, for leaving out ſome of his words in my Quotations, as where he ſaith, in his* Light and Life, *I have left out the Queſtion,* Did *John* ſee him with carnal Eyes, and of the Glory of the Father wherein the Son of Man ſhall come, *Matth.* 16. 27, 28. *Luke* 9. 26, 27. Is it viſible to the carnal eye, *left out. And in the Book,* Chriſt Aſcended, *&c. In none of which* (i. e. *Scriptures quoted*) *is* Jeſus Chriſt *repreſented as a Body of Fleſh*; here Blood and Bones are left out, *which* (he ſaith) *is very unfair, and more unjuſt to render me an Unbeliever thereupon. But I anſwer, none of theſe omiſſions are in the leaſt material, nor ſhew any miſtake or unfairneſs in me: All Writers of Controverſie will grant, that if a Man quote ſo much of his Opponent's words as ſuffice to give the true ſenſe of his words, that's enough to clear him of injuſtice; and when they ſo quote me, though beginning in the middle of a Sentence, and leaving out the latter part of it, as they oft do, if they quote ſo much as give my ſenſe, I blame them not. Now to ſhew that theſe emiſſions I made in* Light and Life *are no-ways material to the prejudice of his Senſe, or of his Cauſe, I have ſet them down, and many more with them, in the Quotation above cited; all which make more and more againſt him; and as for the omiſſion,* Blood and Bones, *left out, after the word* Fleſh, *it was merely accidental, being forgot, either by me in tranſcribing, or by the Printer in his Compoſing, and was wholly an over-ſight. and had the omiſſion of it any ways prejudiced him, I ſhould have acknowledg'd it long before now; for he has in two ſeveral Printed Books cried out againſt me, for this ſo ſmall and ſo innocent omiſſion. But, pray, what doth it advantage his Cauſe to add them? In none of which* (i. e. *Scriptures, as* Rev. 1. 7, 8. *and* 13. 14, 16.) *is* Jeſus Chriſt *either called or repreſented as a Body of Fleſh, Blood and Bones viſibly to come again. Now what gets he of advantage to his Cauſe, by adding what was (by an innocent over-ſight) omitted? Had* G. Whitehead *believed that* Chriſt *would appear again in Fleſh, but without Blood and Bones, he might have charged me with an Injury; but ſeeing he doth not believe that he will come again in that Body that was Crucified, which was then a Body of Fleſh,* Blood, *and* Bones; *and that he not only oppoſeth the*

coming

coming again of Flesh, blood, and bones, but of body also, as understood of that body that was Crucified, it shews him injurious to me; and that instead of clearing himself of his vile Error, he but quibbles, as his manner is.

III. *J. N.* had said, *Christ Ascen.* p. 21. from *Rev.* 1. 7. Those that pierced him in his Body of Flesh, shall see *that Body visibly* come again. Note, *J. N.* saith not, shall see that visible Flesh, Blood and Bones, in that place above cited, but simply Body——*shall see that Body visible come again.* To this *G. W.* opposeth, saying, These are not the Words of Scripture, but added; although to add or diminish, be forbidden, under a Penalty, *Rev.* 22. 18, 19. Yet this Man's Presumption leads him to incur that. [*And he yet further opposeth* J. N.*'s True Christian Doctrin in that place, by saying*] —— And Christ in the Days of his Flesh, wherein he visibly appeared to the World, said, *yet a little while, and the world seeth me no more,* John 14. 19. [*Note, He brings that place,* John 14. 19. *To oppose J. N. his saying* Those that Pierced him in his Body of Flesh, shall see that Body visibly come again. *And now he puts another Addition, and new coined distinction to these Words*; yet a little while, and the world seeth me no more, *i. e. That the world should see* Christ *no more in that manner, wherein they then saw him; that which they then saw of him with their carnal Eyes, they should see no more,* i. e. *as in the Flesh.*] ['But first, If such Additions be allowable, 'no Man can be proved guilty of any Heresie or Error whatsoever; for the 'new Addition of some word or other, that he may craftily devise to bring him-'self off, would excuse him; as if one should say Christ is not without us, and 'really mean it as amply as possible; yet with this Addition, *as wholly without* '*us*, so as not in any wise to be within us; this will bring him off that he is Or-'thodox.

IV. *And indeed this very Trick* G. W. *hath used; for whereas, in his* Christ Ascended, *p.* 24. *He had brought in* J. N. *saying,* By denying any Personal Being of Christ without all Men, at the right Hand of God, but only a † feigned Christ within, then Remission of Sins must die, and Faith also for want of the Object, Christ. [† *Note, Here J. N. opposeth the setting up of* Christ *within only; so as to deny any Personal* Christ *without; which in that case, and under that limitation, J. N. might well call a feigned* Christ *within.*] To this *G. Whitehead* Answers, This manner of Excluding God's Right Hand, and Christ to a limitation out of his People into a * Personal Being, which are not Scripture Terms, still implies him to be a Personal God or Christ, like the *Anthropomorphits* and *Muggletonians* conceit of him. [* *Note, because this was such a broad-fac'd denyal of* Christ, *having any personal being without all Men, in his quoting this Passage in his* Antidote; *p.* 207. *he hath* Fraudulently *put in the Word* (as wholly) *after the Word* limitation; *and thus he thinks to lick himself whole. Why?* G. W. *doth not deny* Christ *to have any being, as wholly without us; for he is in us also by his Spirit, and Light, and Life. But this was not the State of the Controversie, betwixt J. N. and him, but quite otherwise,* viz. *That by denying any personal being of* Christ *without all Men at the Right Hand of* God, *but only a feigned* Christ *within, then Remission of Sins must die, and Faith also, for want of the Object,* Christ. *So that J. N. doth not oppose* Christ *within, but only that false Notion of* Christ only within; *and so denying him to have any personal being without all Men. But the Gloss that* G. W. *hath put on his own Words, by adding* (as wholly) *cannot be here allowed; because* Christ *in respect of his bodily Existence, or body that was Crucified, Dead, Buried, Rose again and Ascended, is wholly without us; otherwise either* Christ's *whole body is in every Saint, or a measure or part of it in one, and another in another, as* G. F. *hath affirmed in his* Great Mystery, *as above quoted; which is to possible otherwise to conceit, than as if a great body of Gun-powder were Fired, and the several Particles of that Fire or Light be dispersed into the Breasts of some thousands of Men; and by that dispersion*

ſion the body of Chriſt *was diſſolved from being a body, having its parts united and joyned; but by its diſſolution and diſperſion into thouſands of parts, each part becomes the Light in every one; but what was the Light within on that Suppoſition, before the body was formed?*

V. Again, He ſaith, p. 69. *Ch. Aſc.* And theſe Words, Chriſt in Perſon, remote in his Body of Fleſh, *&c.* And not in any Man, are not Scripture but added; what ſtrange Conceits and Limitations would *J. N.* put upon the unlimited God, like the old Heretical Monks of *Egypt*, called *Anthropomorphits*, contrary to his own Confeſſion. [*Note, either* G. W. *here turns* Eutychian, *by confounding the Nature of* Chriſt's *Godhead and Manhood, making the Manhood of* Chriſt *to have the ſame Ubiquity and Infiniteneſs that the Godhead hath in all Reſpects; or then he ſtill denyeth any Perſonal or Bodily Exiſtence, or real Body of the Man* Chriſt *in Heaven; becauſe ſo to affirm, he Conſtrueth it to be* Anthropomorphitiſm. *But to cloak his own vile Error, that* Chriſt *hath not a Perſonal Being or Exiſtence of that Body in Heaven which was Crucified; he will vilely repreſent* J. N. *as Guilty of* Anthropomorphitiſm *and* Muggletoniſm; *which held that the Godhead was a Body of an ordinary Size of a Man; which I do not find that* J. N. *did ever imagin; but this is a common Trick in* G. W. *and* Thomas Elwood *alſo, to hide their own Errors, they labour to render other Men's Sayings, though Innocent, to be monſtrous; as the Author of* Satan Diſrob'd, *in that Treatiſe hath well obſerved.*

VI. But that *G. W.* affirmeth that the World ſhall ſee Chriſt no more with carnal Eyes, is a further Diſcovery of his Error. For ſhall not Men living in carnal Bodies ſee him at his laſt coming, as really as *Paul* ſaw him with his Carnal, *i. e.* bodily Eyes, and as the Diſciples ſaw him at his Transfiguration? But the chief thing oppoſed by *G. W.* was Chriſt's having any perſonal or bodily Exiſtence; which becauſe he had not them, the World neither ſhall, nor can ſee it, either with Carnal, or Spiritual Eyes; for what is not in being, cannot be ſeen. And *whether this is not ſufficiently proved againſt him, let the Impartial and Intelligent judge. [*G. W. *in a Book of his, or ſuppoſed to be his, called,* The Malice of the Independent Agent, *Publiſhed ſome Years after the former, called,* Chriſt Aſcended (*which was in* 1669.) *Seemeth to own that* Chriſt *hath the ſame Body in Heaven for Subſtance he had on Earth. But ſeeing this is a flat Contradiction to his Doctrin, in his* Light and Life, *and* Chriſt Aſcended, *until he Retract his former Error, we are not to regard what contradictory Truth he hath ſince owned; for can any Rational Man hold Contradictories to be true?*

VII. Again, *G. Whitehead*, in his *Nature of Chriſtianity*, p. 29. Doſt thou look for Chriſt as the Son of *Mary*, to appear outwardly in a bodily Exiſtence, to ſave thee, according to thy words? p. 30. If thou doeſt, thou mayeſt look until thy Eyes drop out, before thou wilt ſee ſuch an appearance of him. [*Note, Reader, It happened in my firſt Narrative, p.* 40. *that the word,* as the Son of Mary *was omitted, or left out by an overſight, either in me, or the Printer; for which* Tho. Ellwood *ſeverely accuſeth me, crying out of Fraud and Falſneſs for that omiſſion. And though I owe him no thanks for his falſly accuſing me, yet I owe him ſome thanks for remembring me of that omiſſion; for it makes my Proof the more effectual againſt* G. W. *to have it ſet down in that Page; which though it was omitted in that place; yet about half a Page after, it is not omitted, but ſet down in its place. And* Tho. Elwood's *Prejudice againſt me is manifeſt; who feigns moſt falſly, that I was corrected by a Quaker, both for that omiſſion,* and to ſave thee, *being then omitted; and that upon that correction, I was fain to read the Paſſage right, I remember no ſuch thing, and he gives no Evidence of it, but his own bare Report; and for the words,* to ſave thee, *I took notice of the Matter and Senſe of them (though I dropt the Expreſſion) in that very Paragraph immediately after the Quotation, repeating* G. W.'s *words out of his,* The Real Quaker, a Real Proteſtant. *As if* R. G. *would needs have it, that the Saints remained under their Pollution, till the Reſurrection from the Dead; which I ſhewed to be but* G. W.'s *bare Allegation without Proof. And where I ſhewed that* R. Gordon's *words; That he looked for* Chriſt *to come in a bodily Exiſtence to ſave us, had a ſound meaning; becauſe the great Salvation, not from*

the Pollution of Sin, but from all the Effects and Conſequences of Sin, which is its full accompliſhment, will not be till then; acording to which Paul *ſaid, we are ſaved by Hope. Now ſeeing* G. W. *did blame* R. G. *for ſaying he looked for* Chriſt, *as the Son of* Mary, *&c. This makes my proof the more evident againſt him, and proves alſo it could be no wilful Omiſſion of mine. And Thirdly, It proves* T. El. *a deeply prejudiced Perſon againſt me, and a falſe Accuſer of me, for ſaying that he looked for no coming of the Man* Chriſt *without him to Judge the World, for* Chriſt *can come no other way as Man without us, but as the Son of* Mary; *he will not be born of another Woman to come, &c. as* H. Norton *did prophanely Query. And yet moſt injurious and abuſive is* G. W. *to me, to repreſent me, as if as much might be drawn from a paſſage he quotes out of my* Book, Help in time of need, *againſt* Chriſt's *coming in a Bodily Exiſtence, as could be drawn from his words, ſaying, after he has quoted my words, If* G. K. *may be cleared herein, I may be clear from and againſt his own Judgment unduly given upon me. And this he would inferr from theſe words, —— The day of the Lord is of a truth broken up among us, and ye ſhall look till your Eyes fail you, and role within your Eye-holes 'ere ever you ſee another day or appearance of* Jeſus Chriſt *to your Comfort, than what we the People of the Lord, called Quakers do witneſs come, and yet more abundantly coming.* Anſ. *To this I ſay, It's obivous to any Intelligent Reader, that whereas I ſaid they ſhould not ſee another day or appearance of* Jeſus Chriſt *to their Comfort, but what the Quakers did witneſs come, I meant only* Chriſt's *inward appearance, which for Subſtance, and in Effect, is one and the ſame in all the Saints, ſuch as I took the Quakers generally to be; but that miſtake I have before this Corrected, and publiſhed in Print, though I ſtill have that Charity to ſome among them (who have not known the depths of Satan, and who do not hold thoſe vile Errors which I charge upon* G. W. *and his Party) that they are ſuch. Therefore my words quoted by* G. W. *can give no ſhadow of proof, as if I had denied* Chriſt's *coming outwardly as the Son of* Mary, i. e. *in his Glorified Manhood, to Judge the World.*

VII. *W. Baily*, in the Collection of his Works p. 306. ſaith, I never Read in all the Scriptures (as I can remember) of a third coming of *Chriſt*, Perſonally in his own ſingle Perſon, or of a Perſonal Reign, beſides what ſhall be in his Saints. But I have Read of his coming the ſecond time, without ſin unto Salvation, *&c.* which the Apoſtles in their days did witneſs. And pag. 309. —— Who (the Diſciples) never mentioned, as ever I read of, a Perſonal coming, and Reign the third time, or of a third coming in a ſingle Perſonal appearance, as hath been imagined by many, *&c.* Again in p. 300. —— But methinks I hear ſome ſay (in their Reaſonings and Imaginations) *what Body* hath he, and where is it, ſeeing it is ſaid he is at the Right Hand of *God?* This I ſhall anſwer with his own words, which he ſpake here on Earth, *viz. No man aſcended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, the Son of Man which is in heaven; he that hath an Ear to hear let him hear*, and take notice *what* * *Body* that was which came down from Heaven, when *Mary* ſaid unto the Angel, *How can this be, ſeeing I know not a Man?*

[* *Note, Whereas* G. W. *ſaith,* Antidote, p. 194. *He doth acknowledge that* Chriſt, *as the Heavenly Man, has his own glorious proper Body, wherein he will come to Judge the World at the laſt day. If the ſenſe of theſe words of* G. W. *be taken according to his former arguings againſt it, both in his* Light and Life, *and* Chriſt Aſcended, *as above fully ſhewed, and alſo according to the words of* W. Bailey, *juſt now quoted, and which ought to be his ſenſe, ſeeing* J. Pennington *ſaith, Truth is the ſame, and its Principles the ſame, and his People (meaning the Quakers) are the ſame. Then* G. W. *by ſaying, he doth acknowledge that* Chriſt, as the Heavenly Man, *has his own glorious proper Body, wherein he will come to Judge the World at the laſt day, doth mean, that* Chriſt *hath no other Body, but what he brought down from Heaven, and which he had from the beginning of the Creation, if not from all Eternity, which is ſtill the more confirmed, by* G. W.'s *oppoſing* T. D. *for ſaying that* Chriſt, *as he was Incarnate, and the Son of* Abraham, had a Created Soul and Body. *And* E. Burrough *hath affirmed* Chriſt's *Fleſh is Infinite and Eternal.* E. B. *Coll. pag.* 292. *And* E. B. *Collection p.* 305. *He denies* Chriſt *to have two Bodies, one out of the ſight of the Saints, and another, which is the Church.*

Again,

Again, how ſlightly (I think to a high degree of Blaſphemy) *W. Bailey* hath Printed concerning *Chriſt*'s Perſon, (and the Quakers who have reprinted his Works do approve it,) take this following paſſage, p 307. Coll. For they (*viz.* his Diſciples) loved his Perſon for the ſake of the Frame and Quality of the Spirit that dwelt in him; or elſe, what was his Perſon (being mean and contemptible) to them more than another Perſon, but for that which dwelt in him they loved him? Let none miſtake, I do not ſlight it, nor the Perſon of any of his Brethren or Children, as they are prepared to do the Will of their Father. [*Is not this as bad as that ſaying of* Solomon Eccles, *That the blood* [*of* Chriſt] *let out by the Spear, was no more than the blood of another Saint.*]

VIII. Again, *Richard Hubberthorne* Coll. p. 56. brings his Opponent ſaying, let them (*viz.* the Saints) not go forth, before the time, but abide in New Teſtament Worſhip, till the Lord come in Perſon and call them out, and then they ſhall go out altogether: To this he anſwers. How many Souls haſt thou led into that Pit of Darkneſs, as to believe that *Chriſt* is yet to come in Perſon? Now the Scripture which thou bringeſt, *Matth.* 24. 27. proves no ſuch thing, as another *Chriſt* coming in Perſon. [*This is his Perverſion of his Opponent's words, that did not ſay, nor think, of another* Chriſt *coming in Perſon. And this* R. Hubberthorne *boldly gives the lye to the Apoſtles Doctrin; affirming, but moſt falſly,* They did never tell of *Chriſt*'s ſecond coming in Perſon, nor of his Perſonal Reign, *whereas the Apoſtles Doctrin is full and clear concerning it. And when* Chriſt *ſhall come in Perſon to judge the world, his judging the world ſhall be his Act, as a King,* Matth. 25. 34 Then ſhall the King ſay unto them; *and v.* 40. And the King ſhall anſwer *And that this King is the Son of Man, ſee v.* 31.

Some other Proofs to be added to the Fourth Head.

IX. *W. Bailey* in a Warning from the Spirit of Truth, p. 26. Whether that place be near unto the Spirit of Man, where *Chriſt* ſitteth, ſeeing the Apoſtle did exhort People (while they were here upon the Earth) to ſeek the things that are above, where *Chriſt* ſitteth at the Right Hand of *God*, or whether it be at ſuch a diſtance, as above the Starrs, or Firmament, *where Man was neither created or appointed to go or ſeek*, or whether it be poſſible for Man to ſeek and find that which ſaveth the Soul at ſuch a diſtance from him, yea, or nay?

X. *John Pennington* in his *Keith againſt Keith*, p. 125. He quotes me arguing, For the ſameneſs of *Chriſt*'s Body, in ſubſtance, what it was on Earth, and what it is now in Heaven. Did not what our Saviour Eat turn into his real Fleſh, and become Incorruptible? And was not his Body of Fleſh, yet farther changed after his Reſurrection? To this he oppoſeth by another Query, p. 126. ſaying, Again, I Query, Whether that Food (that according to *G. K.* was turned into *Chriſt*'s real Fleſh, which Fleſh was further chan-

ged after the Reſurrection, and became Incorruptible as *G.K.* ſaith) be the ſame in ſubſtance that it was before the change, and when Corruptible? And in p. 128. he oppoſeth my undertaking to demonſtrate, how a Natural and Corruptible ſubſtance hath been changed into a Spiritual one, (he ſaith) he ſhould have added, and yet the Subſtance not changed, for that is the matter in Debate. [*Note, Here he will have it, that when* Chriſt's *Food was changed into his Fleſh, that was a change in Subſtance: And again, when his Body of Fleſh was changed to be a ſpiritual Body, that was another change in ſubſtance, which is a Two-fold Tranſubſtantiation, as groſs as that one of the Papiſts.*) *But obſerve how he concludes, p.* 129. What becomes of our Maſter of Arts now? Had he not better kept to his Employ of Teaching School-boys, than thus to go beyond his Sphere of knowledge, as to draw ſuch Inferences, which would fetch in the very Beaſts of the Field, Fowls of the Air, and Fiſh of the Sea, to become part of *Chriſt*'s Body and Fleſh in Heaven? [*Note, This his Inference is his own fetching in, and argueth his great ignorance (but no ignorance of mine) as well as his being an Infidel, in the great Article of our Lord's Body in Heaven, that he will not allow, that the Food our Lord received of the Fleſh of Beaſts, Birds, and Fiſh, became any part of his Body, untill it was changed from one ſubſtance to another, and from that ſecond to a third ſubſtance after his Reſurrection, when his Body was glorified, and became ſpiritual. And behold his ignorant reaſoning, which doth equally inferr, that when* J. P. *Eateth the Fleſh of Ox or Hog, he hath Oxen and Hogs in his Body, otherwiſe the ſubſtance of the Fleſh of thoſe Creatures is changed to another ſubſtance. If ſo, we may ceaſe to blame the Papiſts Doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation, which they ſay is miraculous; for now, by* J. P. *his Stomach produceth many hundreds of as great Miracles every year, and thrice every day, if he as oft Eat Fleſh every day, or any other Food; becauſe, according to his falſe notions of Philoſophy, (wherein I know not that he hath any Authors for his Preſidents, but* G. W. *and* W. P. *Men, in that Point, as great ignorants as himſelf.) In all Mutations of Bodies, from Earth to Graſs, from Graſs to Fleſh of Brutes, from Fleſh of Brutes to Fleſh of Men, there is a change of the ſubſtance of the Body or Matter, the contrary whereof hath been always Taught, and is at preſent Univerſally Taught, by all Maſters or Teachers of that Part of Philoſophy called Phiſicks, ſo far as ever I did underſtand, and is built on moſt ſolid Reaſons, which I ſhall not here produce; nor ſhould I quarrel with their Ignorance and falſe Philoſophy, but that it deſtroyeth their Faith of theſe two great Articles,* viz. *The Reſurrection of* Chriſt's *Body, and of the Bodies of other Men.*]

Some other Proofs to be added to the Second Head.

W. Penn's Chriſtian Quaker, p. 102. And as outwardly he gave his outward Life for the World, ſo he might inwardly ſhed abroad in their Souls, the Blood of *God*, that is, the holy purifying Life and Virtue which is in him,

him, as the word *God*, and as which he is the Life of the World. [*Note Reader, what an odd Notion* W. Penn *hath here of the Blood of* God, *agreeing with* G. W. *and* S. Criſp. *They will not have the Blood of God, to be the Blood of* Chriſt's *Manhood, but that which is in* Chriſt, *as the word* God. *The Foundation of which Error is, that they will not allow the Man* Chriſt (*by Vertue of the Perſonal Union of the two Natures of* Chriſt, *his Godhead Nature, and his Manhood Nature*) *to be* God, (*For* W.P. *ſaith in his* Serious Apol. *p.* 146. *That the outward Perſon which ſuffered was properly the Son of* God, *we utterly deny*) *contrary plain Scripture, the Word was made Fleſh, and the Man* Chriſt, *that was born of the Virgin is called in Scripture, the Mighty* God, Iſa. 6.9. *And therefore it is, that* G. W. *blames the term,* Chriſt, God-Man, *as Popiſh*: Light and Life, *p.* 39. *And though they will not own the Man that was born of the Virgin, to be the Mighty God, yet they will have the Seed within them to be the Mighty God, as it grows up in them from the Holy Thing, to a Child given, and a Son born; for proof of which I ſhall quote a paſſage in* W. Bailey, *in his* Viſitation from on High, *Collection p.* 291.] So now this *Chriſt* was before the World (that now is) began, and was a Seed before any Name was given to it, which in proceſs of time, (being begotten of *God*) was born of a Virgin, had a Body prepared to do the Will of his Father (*as it is at this day*,) but none knows him, or (ever ſhall) born but of a Virgin (he that hath Ears to hear let him hear) whoſe Eye is ſingle, Mind ſtay'd on *God*, forſakes all, takes up the daily Croſs, denies himſelf, follows the Lamb whereſoever he goeth, loves him that had been Slain, more than all, more than Father, Mother, Wife, Husband, Children, Houſe or Lands, yea, or his own Life; theſe only know him *Born*, though once like *Mary* ſaid, how can this be, ſeeing I know not a Man (ſeeing I have no Strength, Wiſdom, Parts, or Abilities of my own) but the Anſwer is, as it was (*be thou but the Virgin*) the Power of the moſt High ſhall over-ſhadow thee, and *the holy Thing* which ſhall be born of thee ſhall be called the Son of *God*. This was Chriſt's Name in the Womb, a holy thing (read within,) and then had other Names, as Jeſus and Emanuel. —— Awake therefore now ye Shepherds, who have been keeping your Flocks by night, and look upwards, ye Earthly-minded, and behold his Star in the Eaſt, the Wiſe Men (whoſe Eyes are in their Head) have ſeen it, and been led by it, *till the Babe was found lying in a Manger*, for in the Inn there was no room for him; he that hath an Ear to hear let him hear.——Behold a Wonder! a Woman doth Compaſs a Man, and yet ſhe is Cloathed with the Sun. Was there ever ſuch a thing heard of? But this is in Heaven. And none knows it, or ever ſhall (as I ſaid) but the Virgin, who is over-ſhadowed with the Power of the moſt High —— But the Virgin is ſubject to the Power of the moſt High, where Chriſt is known to be firſt, a holy Thing, then a Child given, and a Son born, which is Emanuel, God with us, a Saviour, a wonderful Counſellor, the Mighty God, the Prince of Peace —— But that which may be known of God (or Chriſt which is one) is manifeſt in People, there he is, *and is only to be found*, and he that hath ſeen him

(who

who is the Son) hath ſeen the Father alſo. [*Note Reader, what inconſiſtent things doth* W.B. *here write of Chriſt born within? Firſt, Every one in whom he is thus born muſt be the Virgin; whereof he hath given ſuch a Deſcription (as above mentioned) as can agree to none but a Saint; and that in the moſt eminent degree Sanctified. But how can any Man be a Saint, and ſo eminently ſuch before Chriſt be born, or formed in him? for to perſue the Parallel, as* Mary *was a Virgin, before the Holy thing was Formed in her; ſo Men muſt be the Virgin, highly Sanctified before Chriſt is Formed in them. But how is that poſſible; is not the Forming of Chriſt in Men, the Sanctification it ſelf, or the cauſe of it? To be ſure it cannot be the Effect. Secondly, How can Chriſt, thus Formed in* Men ſo eminently Holy, *be found lying in* a Manget, there being no room for him in the Inn? *Do the Virgin Saints entertain him no better but to lay him in a Manger, and give him no room in their Hearts, but the Manger? Thirdly, Seeing, as he ſaith, this Woman Virgin is in Heaven; is there any Manger in Heaven, or what is that Manger? Fourthly, Is it not moſt abſurd, to imagine how the Holy Seed in Men grows from a Holy Thing in them, to a Child born, whoſe Name is the mighty God? Can any thing Formed in Time, grow to that Perfection, ſo as to be God? The Man born of the bleſſed Virgin, did not grow up to be God; but was God as ſoon as he had a Being, or Manhood Nature, by Vertue of the Perſonal Union, of that with the Godhead; but to imagine any ſuch Perſonal Union (*of two Natures*) in each Saint daily produced,* de novo, *is to feign as many new Chriſt's, as there are Men newly Converted from a State of Unholineſs, to a Holy State; all which carry in them great Inconſiſtencies and Abſurdities. It is true, ſome of the Ancients, as particularly* Auguſtine, *and long after him* Eraſmus, *have by way of Allegory ſaid, If* Mary *had not born Chriſt in her Soul, as ſhe bare him in her Fleſh, he had not been her Saviour; which Allegory they ſeem to have grounded on* Gal. 4. 19. Rev. 12. 1. *and* Matth. 12. 49, 50. *And in the ſame manner and ſenſe I have ſometimes uſed the ſame Allegory in ſome of my former Writings (which becauſe of the wrong uſe that ſome have made of it, I wiſh rather I had not done) But there is a vaſt difference betwixt theſe Ancients ſenſe of Chriſt born within (and alſo of my ſenſe thereof) and the ſenſe of* W. Baily, G. Whitehead, *and* W. Penn; *all which make Chriſt born without the Hiſtory, and Chriſt born within the Myſtery, Chriſt without the Figure, Chriſt within the Subſtance, as is above proved; and as* W. Penn's *words above Quoted do plainly ſhew his Senſe, making Regeneration a greater Miſtery then the Man Chriſt,* God manifeſt in Fleſh without us, *and treating on Chriſt without, and comparing him to Chriſt within in the* Gentiles, *he ſaith,* 'Tis ſtrange that ſhould be reputed moſt Myſterious, which was the Introduction to the Myſtery; and thoſe Tranſactions counted moſt difficult, that were by the Divine Wiſdom of God, Ordained as ſo many facile Repreſentations of what was to be accompliſhed in Man. Some of theſe Tranſactions (to which *W. Penn* refers out of *J. F.*'s words) are, *That Chriſt ſhould Die as a Malefactor, and that his Death ſhould Reconcile God to Man;* which according to *W. P.* are as ſo many

many facile Repreſentations of what was to be accompliſhed in Man.] *What is this Reader, but juſt as I have ſhewed out of* W. Shewen, *and* W. Baily, *the Birth, Life, Death, Reſurrection and Aſcenſion of Chriſt without us, and his Blood and Sacrifice without us, are not the Myſtery, but the Introduction to the Myſtery; and ſo many* Facile Repreſentations *of what is to be accompliſhed in Man,* viz. *Of his Birth, Life, Death, Sacrifice, Blood, Reſurrection and Aſcenſion in us, until he in us give up the Kingdom to the Father; (that is, until we be perfect; which ſome think they already are) and then it is no more Chriſt in them, but God, all in all; for God and Chriſt with the other Names, are but the mulplicity and variety of Diſpenſations and Opperations, according to* W. S. *through which we are to travel, until we come into the Unity; as is above Quoted out of* W. Shewen. *Now the difference betwixt the ſenſe of the Ancients (together with my ſenſe) on the one hand, and the ſenſe of* W. Penn, W. Baily, W. S. *and* G. Whitehead *on the other is, that theſe Ancients (and I alſo underſtand Chriſt born within to be the Allegory, or Figurative manner of Speech, and Chriſt without, not to be any Allegory at all; but the greateſt Miſtery of all, next to that of the Holy Trinity; and though Chriſt within is a real Truth, and no Allegory; yet to ſay he is born within Men, is an Allegory, and ſignifieth not any new Production or Creation of any new ſubſtance in the Saints, but a certain myſtical and ſpiritual Union betwixt Chriſt the living word, and the Saints; the which Allegory, or Similitude, is not to be too far carried or applied; but ſo far as to ſignifie the neceſſity of our Being, made conformable to Chriſt in his Death, Sufferings and Vertues, through the work of Sanctification and Regeneration. And though this is a Myſtery, yet it is not to be compared to the Myſtery of Chriſt,* the word Incarnat *without us, either to be equalled to it, or preferred thereunto; as* W. Penn *expreſly hath done, but is incomparably inferior to it. They again, on the other hand, make Chriſt born without,* the word made Fleſh, *the Allegory of Chriſt born within; whereas much rather Chriſt born within, is the Allegory, or Similitude of Chriſt born without; and though a great Miſtery, yet is but (comparatively ſpeaking) to uſe* W. Penn's *Phraſe, in a far differing ſenſe,* but a Facile Repreſentation or Reſemblance of Chriſt born without us, *in whom the Fulneſs of all Grace and Truth dwells, and of whoſe Fulneſs we all receive, and Grace for Grace. So that what was done, and accompliſhed in the Man Jeſus of* Nazareth *without us, and his moſt Holy and Perfect Obedience (ſo far as is imitable by us) is that Original, and moſt excellent Exemplar and Archetype Pattern, according to which the Saints are made conformable; and the Life of Chriſt in the Saints, is like the Life of the Tree in the Branches; but in the Man Chriſt, as Life in the Root and Stock. And as inconſiderate is* W. Penn *in his Diſtinction of Chriſt without, being a* general Saviour, *and of Chriſt within, a* particular Saviour; Quaker New Nick-Name, p. 13. *For he is as really a* particular Saviour *to us who are ſaved by him, as he Died for us, Roſe again and Aſcended, as he is inwardly revealled in us, becauſe by the Operation of his Spirit in us, we are taught and enabled to*

apply

apply effectually to us, the Vertue, Efficacy, and Merit of his Death to our particular Salvation; ſo that we can ſay he Died for us in particular; and therefore he is as truly our particular Saviour, as he Died for us, as he doth inwardly enlighten us; ſo that in both reſpects he is our particular Saviour. Compare this odd Doctrin of G. W. W. B. W. Shewen, *and* W. Penn, *with the Doctrin of* Richard Coppin, *in a Sermon of his, at* Giles's Cripplegate, London, *Printed,* 1654. *This* Richard Coppin *was not one, called a Quaker, but a Ranter. In his Title Page, He calleth Chriſt born of the Virgin* Mary *in the Fleſh, a Sign, his being born in us the Subſtance. He takes his Text from* Iſaiah 9. 6. Unto us a Child is born, *p.* 4. *Here he ſaith the Prophet ſpeaks in the Preſent Tenſe, and from this concludes the Prophecy then was fulfilled, that Chriſt was the Child then born, and in all Ages was, and is ſtill to be ſo born. And* Cap. 3. *p.* 6. *He ſaith, Chriſt born of the Virgin* Mary *was* but *a ſign or ſhadow of his being born in you in Spirit and Glory; and for Proof of this, he moſt Blaſphemiouſly Perverts that place of Scripture,* Iſaiah 7. 14. The Lord himſelf ſhall give you a Sign, behold a Virgin ſhall Conceive [but Sign there, is not to be underſtood Type, Figure or Shadow, but Miracle; as commonly in Scripture Miracles are called Signs] *And to this he applies that in* Jer. 31. 22. *A Woman ſhall compaſs a Man, and ſo doth* W. Baily. *And in p.* 29. *He calls Chriſt born without the Hiſtory, and Chriſt born within the Myſtery (even as* G. W. *calleth Chriſt's Blood without the Hiſtory, but the ſpiritual Blood within the Myſtery) and he ſaith* Mary *is the Fleſh, or Human Nature;* Joſeph *is the Wiſdom of this Fleſh, and ſo he purſueth his whole Matter; making* Mary, Joſeph, Jeſus, *and* Herod, *without to be all but Types and Signs of* Mary, Joſeph, Jeſus *and* Herod within.

And like to this of Richard Coppin, *is a Paſſage in* Humphry Smith's Collection, Hidden Things made Manifeſt, *p.* 2.——*For becauſe of Sin was the Law added, and it was given in the Wilderneſs, where ſometimes there was want of Bread and Water; where were Serpents, Scorpions, and many Tryals where the Figure of him, who was to Heal the Wounded, and take away the Sting of Death, and ſave the Life of Man was lifted up on high without them; the which Figure, or outward bodily Appearance was prepared by* Moſes. *And Chriſt had a Body prepared him; both which the Carnal Eye might ſee, and the Carnal Mind contend about, even as the Devil about the Body of* Moſes. *But the ſubſtance of* the Figure, *Chriſt the Light, God's Power being not received within in the Heart; and ſo ſin (the Tranſgreſſion of the Law) remains within. And the* Figure, or that which the Natural Eye did, or may ſee, was, and is looked upon without, and that without, doth not take away the Sin within, And theſe knew not the ways of God, who Sinned,* &c.

* *Note, How he twice calleth Chriſt's Body a Figure, and diſtinguiſheth it from the Subſtance, and ſayeth that without,* (viz. *The Body of Chriſt*) *doth not take away the Sin within. Here inſtead of joyning the Body and Spirit together, for the taking away the Sin, he gives it wholly to the Spirit or Light within, and poſitively denyeth it to that without; to wit, the viſible Body of Chriſt.*

An

An Anſwer to ſome foul, but moſt unjuſt, Charges of Th. Ellwood, *and* John Pennington *againſt me; as being Guilty of Treachery and Falſhood, Fraudulent Dealing, Forgery, Perverſion, abominable Falſhood and Fraud, Deceit and Malice, in giving wrong Quotations out of their Printed Books, changing, leaving out, and perverting their words in the Quotations.*

THat the great Injuſtice of this Charge may appear, and alſo my Innocency and Integrity, I have pitched upon ſome of the moſt remarkable Places wherein they ſo angrily charge me, and ſhall lay them before the impartial and diſcreet Reader, to judge betwixt my Adverſaries and me in the Caſe, beſide thoſe out of *G. W.* and *T. Ell.* above mentioned.

In *Thomas Ellwood's* Anſwer to my firſt Narrative p. 134. He blames me for giving *W. B.* the Baptiſt's words thus, Neither did I ever read, that it was the Blood or Life of *Chriſt* in his People that we are Juſtified by; and thence paſſeth this ſevere Cenſure upon me; *See now* (ſaith he) *the Treachery of this falſe Man*, in ſetting down the Baptiſt's words. The Baptiſt's words were theſe, *Neither did I ever read, that it was the Blood or Life in* Chriſt, *or the Life of* Chriſt *in his People, that we are Juſtified by*, he leaves out the words [in Chriſt] and makes it only the Blood or Life of Chriſt in his People, whereas (ſaith he) the Baptiſt's words import a denyal of Juſtification, not only by the Life of Chriſt in his People, but by the Blood or Life in Chriſt himſelf.

Anſ. No Impartial Reader, I hope, will judge my Citation to be unfair or falſe, for quoting only ſo much of the Baptiſt's words, as did ſerve to ſhew the principal ſtate of the Queſtion betwixt him and *G. W.* which was not as if the Baptiſt denyed Juſtification by the Material Blood, that was once in Chriſt's Body and came afterwards to be ſhed; for this, all along, the Baptiſt did ſtrongly affirm, and *G. W.* did ſtrongly oppugne, but with falſe Arguments, as is above ſhewed; but the Queſtion betwixt them was this, Whether the Blood (which *G. W.* and others call the Life, and that Life the Light) of Chriſt in his People is that we are Juſtified by: So that, it was not any outward or material Blood of Chriſt, or in Chriſt, that afterwards came to be ſhed, that *W. B.* oppoſed, but *G W.*'s Notion of an inward Blood of Chriſt that was the Light within People for Juſtification; as will appear by a more full Quotation of them, as followeth.

P. 42. He gathers an Inference from ſome words in *S. E.*'s blaſphemous Letter, thus, ' From hence we may clearly gather, that the Quakers do real-
' ly deny that Blood, that was ſhed or let out of him upon the Croſs, to
' be the Blood of Chriſt; but the Blood they own, the Eye muſt be opened
' to ſee within: And therefore he tells you from *Heb.* 9. 14. That it was
' offered up in the Eternal Spirit. But I muſt confeſs I am as Ignorant of

'any ſuch Blood, as may be. I have often read of the Blood he offered, 'through the Eternal Spirit, and that Chriſt offered up himſelf once for all, 'Heb. 10. 10. But never read of Chriſt offering up himſelf *in* all, according 'to their Notions; neither did I ever read, that it was the Blood or Life 'in Chriſt, or the Life of Chriſt in his People, that we are Juſtified by, 'but the Life of Chriſt laid down, and the Blood Chriſt ſhed upon the Croſs 'for Man, that is the means or cauſe of the Juſtification of Man.] Now that *G. W.* hath oppoſed Juſtification by the Blood ſhed upon the Croſs, and wholly turned it to a Myſtical or Spiritual Blood within People, which he ſaith is not of another kind from the Spirit, is ſufficiently evident out of what I have above quoted out of him, in his *Light and Life*, in divers places.

Again, in pag. 215. of his ſaid Anſwer, He chargeth me that I Pervert *W. Penn*'s words to a wrong Senſe; and therein abuſe him; for *W. Penn*'s words are, *All muſt know a Death to their Fleſhly ways and Religions* (which word *Fleſhly ways and Religions* G. K. left out, *ſee his abominable Falſhood and Treachery*) yea their knowledge of Chriſt himſelf after the Fleſh, *&c.*

Anſ. I deſire the Reader, for his own Satisfaction (that he may not take any thing on bare truſt, either from *T. E.* or me) to read the Quotation I made in my firſt Narrative, to which *T. E.* refers, where he will find, that the words *Fleſhly ways and Religions* I have not left out, but expreſly put them down in their place and order, as I found them in *W. Penn's Rejoynder*, then quoted by me, and by this means he will find, that *the Falſhood and Treachery* is not mine, but *Th. Ellwood's* who hath ſo unjuſtly accuſed me. The words of *W. Penn* in his ſaid *Rejoynder*, and as truly quoted by me, being theſe —— 'Seventhly, becauſe that Fleſh of Chriſt is called a Vail, 'but he himſelf is within the Vail, which is the Holy of Holieſt whereinto 'Chriſt Jeſus, our High Prieſt, hath entred, *Heb.* 10. 20, 21. And as he 'deſcended into, and paſt through a Suffering State in his fleſhly appearance, 'and returned into that State of Immortality and Eternal Life and Glory, 'from whence he humbled himſelf, which was and is the Holy of Holieſt '(then obſcured or hid by his Fleſh or Body, the Vail while in the World) 'ſo muſt all know a Death to their Fleſhly ways and Religions, yea, their 'knowledge of Chriſt himſelf after the Fleſh, or they ſtick in the Vail, and 'never enter into the Holy of Holies, nor come to know him in any Spi-'ritual Relation, as their High and Holy Prieſt, that abides therein. And whereas I had made three Obſervations on theſe words of *W. P.* As 1. his ſaying, Chriſt has entred into the Holy of Holies within the Vail, and that Vail is his Fleſh, and that Holy of Holies is himſelf, what Nonſenſe is this? Was not Chriſt always in himſelf? 2. His entring in within the Vail of his Fleſh, is either perfect Nonſenſe, or it hath this Senſe, that he hath put off his Body he had on Earth, and is ſeparated from it. 3. That he ſaith, all muſt know a Death to their knowledge of Chriſt after the Fleſh, it is plain from his words, that he hath this unſound Senſe of it, that they muſt know

a Death

a Death to the knowledge of Chriſt after the Fleſh, as that Fleſh ſignifieth the Fleſh of Chriſt, as he came in the Fleſh. But theſe three Obſervations *Th. Ellwood* will needs have it that they are my Perverſions of *W. P.*'s words; but whether they are ſo or not, I refer to the judicious Reader; If he will be at the pains to compare the places, and conſider *Th. Ellwood*'s words, how he endeavours to make it appear, to which I refer in his own Book; only I deſire the Reader to notice *W. Penn*'s words as truly cited, in the beginning of the Quotation, (which are as a Key to the following) becauſe that Fleſh of Chriſt is called a Vail, but he himſelf is within the Vail, which is the Holy of Holieſt, whereinto Chriſt Jeſus our High Prieſt hath entred. From this I obſerved, that according to *W. P.* Chriſt is the Holy of Holieſt into which he hath entred, for the relative *which*, in that Sentence, I can find no antecedent unto, but *himſelf*. And though Chriſt's Fleſh is called a Vail in Scripture, yet I no where find in Scripture, that he is ſaid to enter within the Vail of his Fleſh, for both his Soul and Body, united to his Godhead, entred into Heaven, which is the true Holy of Holies, made without Hands; and therefore the Vail, through which he entred, could not be his Body, but the Viſible Heavens, through which he paſſed into the Inviſible Heavens.

Again, in pag. 221. He falls moſt ſeverely on me, with his foul Language, ſaying of me, What, ſhall I call this dealing of his, *a Forgery, Falſity, or Perverſion? a manifeſt Perverſion* to be ſure it is, and that *a groſs and vile one —— What Man living can eſcape the laſh of his falſe Tongue?* But what is the matter of this ſevere Charge? Why, *G. K.* (he ſaith) pretending to repeat my words, leaves out that Clauſe, *He had bowed his Head and given up the Ghoſt.*

'*Anſ.* I did not pretend to repeat all his words, but had ſaid expreſly, 'Narrative pag. 60. I ſhall only now make an Index of ſome of his vile and 'groſs Errors, contained in his laſt Book, called, *Truth Defended.* 1. The 'Blood that came out of Chriſt's Side, its Shedding was not done to com-'plete the Offering, becauſe before that Chriſt ſaid *Conſummatum eſt*, it is 'finiſhed. This I ſtill charge to be an Error, and one at leaſt of his Argu-'ments (as I did apprehend him,) for his Aſſertion was, for he had pronoun-'ced that great word *Conſummatum eſt*, it is Finiſhed; his word *for* (as 'ſeemed to me) ſhews he made the ſaying *it was Finiſhed* an Argument, that 'the Blood that came out of Chriſt's Side, its Shedding was not done to com-'plete the Offering. This he had poſitively affirmed; however, that the 'piercing of Chriſt's Side he did not believe was done to complete the Offe-'ring, p. 99. *Truth Defended*: The which vile Error of *T. Ellwood* is effectu-'ally refuted in the Book called *Satan Diſrob'd*, p. 19. 20. to which I refer 'the Reader. Thus I hope the Impartial Reader will ſee how unjuſtly *T. E.* 'hath fallen ſo foully upon me.

Again, in pag. 222. He blames me for changing his words, from the gift of the Promiſed Seed, to the gift of the Divine Grace or Power within, which (he ſaith) quite alters the Senſe of the place.

Anſ. Reader, For thy Satisfaction, that thou mayeſt ſee my Innocency, and his Injuſtice, I ſhall ſet down my Words, as Quoted by him, in his *Truth Defended*, p. 120. 'Though Chriſt did not become the Seed of the Woman, 'according to the Senſe of that place of Scripture, *Gen.* 3. Until the fulneſs of 'Time, that he was made of a Woman; yet ſeeing that Divine Power that in-'wardly did deſtroy the Power of Sin and Satan in true Believers in him that was 'promiſed to come, was the real Power of him that was to come, and *the Gift* '*of it*, was the real purchaſe of his moſt holy and perfect Obedience unto 'Death, when he came; it is truly ſaid, that he bruiſed the Serpents Head in 'all true believers in all Ages. *To this he replyeth, This is ſo Obſcure a Paſſage, and ſo intricately worded, that though I underſtand* Engliſh *pretty well, I do not well know how to underſtand this, unleſs he means that Chriſt as he was Man, made of a* Woman; *in the fulneſs of time did bruiſe the Serpents Head in true believers in all Ages, before he was made of a* Woman; *and that the Gift of the promiſed Seed was not a free Gift, or did not proceed from the free Love of God to Man (contrary to* John 3. 16. God ſo loved the World, *&c.) But was the real Purchaſe of Chriſt's moſt holy and perfect Obedience unto Death when he came.* Where Note, That the Vice whereof he moſt unjuſtly blamed me, he is guilty of himſelf; for the words which were Originally mine, as Quoted by him, I did keep too, and reſcue from his change which he made of them, *to the Gift of the promiſed Seed.* Now can any Man blame me for adhering to my own words, which he had adulterated and changed? My words, *the Gift of it*, have wholly a Relation to the Divine Power that inwardly did deſtroy the Power of Sin and Satan in true Believers. And though he pretends ſo well to know *Engliſh*, and knows not well how to underſtand that Paſſage, which he calls ſo obſcure; yet whatever Knowledge he has of *Engliſh*, (of which he ſeems vain) his both Injuſtice and Ignorance is manifeſt by his words; firſt, his Injuſtice in changing my words, and when changed, in not keeping to my Senſe; for though he changed my words, yet I reckoned he kept to my Senſe, which now he denyeth, and will not allow the Gift of the promiſed Seed (which are his change of my words) to ſignifie the Divine Grace or Power that was given inwardly of God, for Chriſt's ſake, as he was to come and perform that moſt Holy Obedience when he came. But to detect yet more his Fallacy, by the Gift of the promiſed Seed, he means it ſeems the viſible Man Chriſt, as he was born of the Virgin; as when by the City of *London*, is meant *London*, the City; and thus he has Conſtrued my words; as if I meant that the viſible Man Chriſt, was the Gift of the viſible Man Chriſt, and the Purchaſe of his Obedience; which is a manifeſt Perverſion of his, not any Perverſion of mine; but *the Gift of the promiſed Seed*, may ſignifie the Gift, that is, the Divine Grace and Power that Men have by the promiſed Seed, *viz.* The Man Chriſt born of the Virgin; as the *Grace* of Chriſt ſignifieth one thing, and *Chriſt* another, and in this Senſe I underſtood the words of the promiſed Seed. *Secondly*, His Ignorance is evident, that he doth not underſtand how, according to my plain *Engliſh* words, any inward Grace, or Divine Power that the Faithful had before Chriſt came in the Fleſh, was the real Purchaſe of Chriſt's moſt Holy Obedience when he came, as well as the Remiſſion of Sin was to all

the

the Faithful before he came. For a Moral Effect can be before a Moral Cauſe, and oft is, though a Phyſical cannot, as I Anſwered to *G. Whitehead*, when he Argued againſt me, before many Witneſſes at *London*, 1694. at a Meeting in *Grace-Church-Street*, for ſaying any Light within, or Grace that Men have in any age of the World, it was the Effect of Chriſt's Obedience when he came. But ſaid *G. W.* Men had Light and Grace within, before Chriſt came to perform that Obedience; can the Effect be before the Cauſe? And by the like Argument, he may deny that any had Remiſſion of Sin for Chriſt's Cauſe before he came; as I know ſome that have denyed it by the ſame Argument.

Again, p. 144. of his ſaid Anſwer to my firſt Narrative. For my ſaying *G. W.* in his latter Writings, owns that Chriſt's Body that roſe is the ſame with his Body that Suffered; he thus chargeth me. Here he uſes the Word *latter*, deceitfully and maliciouſly, to inſinuate, as if *G. Whitehead* had not owned this, till now of late; Quoting the Book, *Malice of the Independent Agent*. That he confeſſeth was Writ in the Year 1678. and he denyeth not to be *G. Whitehead's*. *Anſwer*, But ſee Reader, whether the Deceit and Malice is *T. Elwood's*, and not mine. The Proofs I brought out of *G Whitehead's Chriſt Aſcended*. [*That Chriſt has not any Perſonal Being without us in Heaven, charging it to be Anthromorphitiſm, and Muggletoniſm, for any to hold that he hath*] were Printed in the Year 1669. And his Book, the *Light and Life*, out of which I have brought my Proofs, that Chriſt had not that Body in Heaven that Suffered on Earth. (See the foregoing Quotations on the 3*d*. and 4*th* Heads) was Printed 1668, as the Title Pages ſhew, and his 3*d*. Book, the *Nature of Chriſtianity*, was Printed 1671. Out of which I proved that *G. Whitehead* did Argue againſt Chriſt his having any bodily Exiſtence in Heaven outwardly, p. 41. Now can *Thomas Elwood* be ſo bad an Accountant, or Arithmetician, as not to know that 1678, the Date of the *Malice of the Independent Agent*, is 7 Years latter than 1671, the Date of the Nature of Chriſtianity; and that 1669, the Date of Chriſt Aſcended, is 9 Years latter, and 1668, the Date of *Light and Life* is 10 Years latter; am I therefore to be accuſed of Deceit and Malice, for ſaying what I have ſufficiently proved, and which the words of the Books, and their Dates ſufficiently prove? Is it not manifeſt, that theſe ſevere Charges againſt me without any juſt Ground, proceed from deep Prejudice; and where he and his Brethren cannot find a Fault, they will make one, the more to abuſe me?

Again, *John Pennington*, in his *Fig Leaf*, &c. p. 92. Chargeth me with Fraudulent Dealing, in Quoting ſome words of W. *Penn*, out of his *Serious Apology*, becauſe I had Quoted them thus; That Man, or outward Perſon that Suffered at *Jeruſalem*, is not properly the Son of God. Whereas the words as *John Pennington* Quotes them, are thus: That the outward Perſon which Suffered, was properly the Son of God; we deny. Judge Reader, Where is the Fraudulent Dealing here? Is there any real difference of the Senſe, betwixt my Quoting and his? I well remember when I Quoted that Paſſage, I had not W. *Penn's Serious Apology* by me; but I knew I had ſo much of his words in my Remem-

Remembrance that could give the true Sense of them, and all the change is in meer Circumstance. If *J. P.* can shew me that the outward Person, was not a Man, I will own my Mistake and Failure. And it is plain by using the Disjunctive, *or*; I reckoned Man and outward Person, synonimous, as generally Men so reckon; and though the Soul is the more principal part, yet the Body is a true and proper part, and by outward Person is meant both Soul and Body. And when one buyeth a Slave, he buyeth a living Man, having both Soul and Body; and if the simple omission, or changing of a word, not altering the Sense, is Fraudulent Dealing, *John Pennington* is much more guilty, who hath left out the word *utterly*; *W. P*'s words being, *that the outward Person which Suffered, was properly the Son of God, we utterly deny.* Is not *W. Penn* here a greater Unbeliever than the Roman *Centurion*; who said of the Man, or outward Person that Suffered Death, *Mat.* 27. 54. Together with others present; *verily this was the Son of God.* And doth not the Scripture say, *Acts* 3. 15. *Yet killed the Prince of Life*? Or doth *W. P.* think that his Wisdom hath taught him to speak more properly, than the Holy Ghost taught *Peter* and the Apostles? Seeing that visible Man, or outward Person had no immediate Father, but God; was he not truly and properly the Son of God, according to his Generation in the Fulness of Time, as he was also the Son of God by Eternal Generation, before all Ages; and yet but one Son of God? But *J. Pennington* here, instead of proving me guilty of Fraudulent Dealing, proveth himself guilty of it, by a false Quotation, he gives of W. *P.* Saying that Testimony was born by W. *P. That he who suffered was Christ the Son of the most high God,* but no such words do I find in that place; the true Quotation being this; *that he that laid down his Life, and suffered his Body to be Crucified by the* Jews, *without the Gates of* Jerusalem, *is Christ the only Son of the most high God.* And thus *J. P.* at first Quotes him; but though W. *P.* saith, he that suffered his Body to be Crucified, was Christ the Son of the most high God; yet he doth not say, he who Suffered was Christ; The difference of these two Sayings is great, as to say, God the Father suffered Christ's Body to be Crucified; it will not thence follow, that he who Suffered was God the Father: Of the same Tendency is, p. 62. *Light and Life.* That of *G.* W.s justifying that Antichristian Assertion; that Christ was never seen with a carnal Eye, contrary to Christ's own words, *John* 6. 36. Thus Reader, I have given thee a sufficient Tast of these Men's Injustice, in so falsly accusing me; whereof I could give many other Instances; but that so to do would be tedious, but according to the Proverb, the Bear may be known by his Foot.

A Copy

A Copy of a Letter from William Penn *to* George Keith. Briſtol, *the 16th of the 2d Month*, 1698.

George Keith,

'IT is ſome Surpriſe, thou ſhould'ſt be unwilling, after thy many Summons and Challenges, to meet me at a Select Meeting in my particular Caſe, 'when thou ſeemeſt by thy General Letter, to propoſe a Select one for us All, 'that thou haſt Summoned to appear at *Turners Hall.*

'The Excuſe thou giveſt, looks to me not ſo Candid as might have been ex-'pected from a Man of thy Pretences, ſince what Injury thou ſuppoſeſt I have 'done, might by the Report of ſuch a Meeting have been Repaired, as Credi-'bly as if a greater Number of Witneſſes. For if thou art only to be Righted, 'as publickly as thou thinkeſt thou wert Wronged, no leſs Number than what 'was there, if any other Perſons, or Place ought to ſatisfie thee. But when 'thou calleſt to mind how publickly thou haſt Staged and Condemned us, for 'the worſt of Hereticks, without any Limitation of Number, or Regard to 'Qualifications of Perſons, or our Conſent at all to ſuch a Meeting, Citing us, 'Arraigning and Condemning us not only Arbitrarily, but without a Copy of 'our Indictment; naming to us neither the Subject of thy Exceptions, nor the 'Books out of which thou takeſt them, and leſs, the Paſſages attack'd and op-'pugn'd by thee. But that which augments my Wonder, is, That for all the 'Wrongs thou haſt, or may'ſt commit againſt me, thou thinkeſt I ought to be 'ſatisfied with a Select Meeting of equal Choice, in order to Right me. Now 'I cannot underſtand, why it is not as reaſonable for me to propoſe a Select 'Meeting, equally choſen, in order to hear thy Exceptions againſt me, as for 'thee to propoſe ſuch an one, after thou haſt, in my Opinion, Injured me in 'order to make me Satisfaction. Is not Prevention better than the Diffi-'culty of a Cure? But would'ſt thou be willing we ſhould chuſe *Arbitrators* 'as thou calleſt them) for thee, as thou haſt done for us? Or would'ſt thou 'think us equal and fair (if we were to chuſe) to pick out thoſe that have pre-'judg'd thy Caſe? That believe thee Erroneous, and that are of a Church that 'has perſecuted thee, and who are of the Sentiment, if not of the Charity to-'wards thee, that the Rattle-Snake Man is towards us. But by thy laſt Let-'ter it ſeems to me, as if thou didſt deſign not to have us preſent; and indeed 'in thy former Letters alſo, by making the Conditions ſo unequal; or rather 'in allowing us none at all, and ſo putting us beyond a poſſibility of comply-'ing with thee. For who was ever thought a fair Adverſary, that refuſed the 'Perſons charged any ſhare about Time, Place, or Auditory? Or a Copy of 'the Matters to be exhibited againſt them? Should we treat all ſorts of Ad-'verſaries at this rate, and every Party of Proteſtants one another, that have 'Differences and Controverſies about them; what a State of Confuſion and Striſe, 'as well as Injuſtice, would the Nation be in? But I fear thou car'ſt not what

'thou

'thou doſt to be revenged upon ſome of the People, called *Quakers*; and indeed, 'upon all of them, and their *Profeſſion* too, for their ſakes, becauſe they could 'not diſſemble with their own Conſciences, in winking at thy Proceedings; 'ſo unlike thy former *Principles* and Conduct, when thou wert as good a Man, 'and as much thy ſelf, as thou haſt been ſince every jot. O, *George Keith*! 'tis 'hard for thee to kick againſt all theſe *Pricks*! The Lord give thee Repentance, 'that through a deep and effectual Sorrow, thou may'ſt be forgiven thy very 'heinous Offences, and be reſtored to the Flock of God, that thou art ſo ſadly 'gone aſtray from, if not too late. This is the fervent deſire of (I think, I may 'ſay) the moſt evilly entreated of all thy old Friends, and yet thy well wiſhing 'Friend for all that,

William Penn.

A Letter from George Keith *to* William Penn, *in Anſwer to a Printed Letter of his, bearing Date,* Briſtol 16th. *of the* 2d. *Month,* 1698.

William Penn,

"AS I wrote to thee formerly, in anſwer to thy firſt, bearing date the firſt of the Second Month 98. I now again ſay, I could not, in Reaſon and Juſtice, aſſent to ſuch a "clandeſtine and diſadvantageous Meeting as thou then propoſedſt, to meet me with two or "three of my Friends, or ſix, to hear what I had to ſay to thee; I allowing thee the ſame freedom. "Thou and thy Friends having publickly wronged me, in the face of the Nation, (as I Judge, "I ought to have a more publick Hearing and Tryal, than before ſo few that are *Parties*) "And I thought it but equal, that ſeeing the debate betwixt us is chiefly about *Principles "and Doctrins of Religion*, that we have ſome *indifferent and impartial Perſons*, of Chriſtian and "Proteſtant Principles, of neither party, to Judge betwixt us; and ſome ſuch (I wrote to "thee) I judge I had found, who were to be preſent at the time I mentioned in the Paper "I ſent thee: That this my reaſonable anſwer ſhould be ſome ſurprize to thee, and not to look "to thee ſo Candid as thou tells me in the beginning of thy Letter I cannot hinder. It ſufficeth "me, that (I queſtion not) my refuſal of ſuch a Clandeſtine Meeting, will ſeem rational to any "indifferent Perſons that hear it, and that my frequent experience of the ill uſage I recei- "ved from thee in particular, as well as from thy Party, at *private Meetings* I had formerly with "thee and them, hath enough convinced me, that a *private Meeting* with thee on the terms "thou propoſedſt, would be of no Service. What might be expected to be the work of ſuch "a *Meeting*, where we ſhall have no indifferent Perſons addicted to either ſide, to give a "free and impartial Judgment betwixt us? And how can thy *Conſcience* ſatisfie thee to pro- "poſe ſuch a *private Meeting*, after thou hadſt at a *publick Meeting* at *Ratcliff*, before ſome Hun- "dreds, without any juſt Cauſe or Provocation of mine, interrupted me in my Diſcourſe, "paſt Sentence on me (Pope like) *That I was an Apoſtate, an Enemy to the Truth and Friends, "that I endeavoured to pluck up the Teſtimony of Truth by the Roots*, profeſſing to do all this *in "the Name of the Lord*; and withall, falſly charging me in matter of Fact. And not long "after this, thy joyning with thy Confederates in a publick Sentence of *Excommunication* "againſt me (containing mere generals, without any particular notice of any thing, either "in Doctrin or Morality that ye had to charge me) at your Yearly Meeting at *London*, 1695 "which I had good cauſe to believe was mainly procured by thy means. And ſuch was "thine, and their barbarous way of Behaviour towards me, that ye would ſuffer none, "that profeſſed any Friendſhip to me, to be preſent to witneſs to your Proceedings againſt "me; and all this without any fair Tryal, before impartial Perſons; and in ſuch an un-

"orderly

" derly and unmanly way, as not to put any of your Names to it, but getting a Boy, your " Hireling Clark to ſign it for you, not ſo much as mentioning what People it came from. " Can thy *Conſcience* think ſuch a *private Meeting*, as thou propoſedſt, would have ſufficed to " do me Juſtice, or anſwer my juſt Requeſt in the Caſe? Beſides, ſome of thy Party have, " in Print, charged me with actings repugnant to the *great Charter, Fundamental Laws* " *and Liberties of* England, *and the late Act of Parliament*, for Tolleration to Diſſenting Pro- " teſtant Subjects, which are Charges of a very high Nature, and ſeem very injurious to " many, as well as to me; I being conſcious of my Innocency, did not think fit, nor do, " to lye under theſe Slanders, but judge it convenient to uſe ſuch Chriſtian Methods, as " my Chriſtian Name may be preſerved againſt your Defamations. And for all thy preten- " ſions to love in thy Letter to me, thou knoweſt in thy Conſcience, what unbounded li- " berty thou haſt uſed to defame me, whereof I have had ſome true Intelligence. Next to " the Honour of God, and the good of my Soul, I am concerned, as a Chriſtian Man, " to regard the condition of my Family, both which thou, and thy Brethren have ſought " to ruin and deſtroy, that your falſe Prophecies might be fulfilled upon me. But God in " his infinite Mercy hath hitherto preſerved me, and I hope he ſtill will, and defeat your evil " devices againſt me; thy deeds towards me ſufficiently contradict thy profeſſions of love: If " thou thinkſt thou haſt obliged me with thy Favours *(which were never ſo great as to brag of)* " I think thou haſt more diſobliged me, by thy *Injuſtice, and Unchriſtian proceedings.* Muſt " I be unfaithful to God, to keep *Friendſhip* with thee? No man that knows the Laws of " *true Friendſhip* will ſay it. If thy Mind had been humble, my Oppoſition to thy Errors, " and other things I juſtly diſliked in thee, would have been received by thee as the beſt " Token of *Friendſhip and Gratitude*. It is thy great weakneſs, that thou loveſt more to be *Flattered* " than *Admoniſhed*. Couldſt thou hear me patiently, I would yet adviſe thee to come down in " thy Mind, and practice that *Humility, Self-denial*, and *bearing the Croſs*, that thou haſt ſo " much Preached, and Printed, but too little practiſed: *Let no Croſs, no Crown be thy Practice* " *as well as thy Doctrin.* Ceaſe to father thy Errors and Injuſtice upon the Spirit of God, as " thou haſt manifeſtly done. It was a fearful Sin in thee, when thou was tranſported with " ſinful Wrath and Paſſion againſt me, at *Ratcliff* Meeting, to juſtifie it not long after at " the Yearly Meeting of the Quakers, to whom I complained of thy behaviour, by calling " it *a tranſport of the glorious power of God*. I thank God, who hath further enlightned me of late " years, that I have ſeen cauſe to correct divers things amiſs in my former Books, and who " hath alſo made me willing to do it, *(yet ſtill adhering with Faith and Love, to whatever of* " *Truth I have formerly aſſerted.)* I never thought my ſelf perfect, nor do I ſo now think: " And if thou ſeeſt not thy Imperfections, both in Doctrin and Life, it is no good Sign: " If thou ſeeſt them, what hinders but thou ſhouldſt correct them, and ſhew thy ſelf a good " Example to others to do the like? I ſhould be glad, thou and others, profeſſing to be " Teachers, would lay to heart, and begin to examine, whether there are not things in your " Doctrin, and Practice alſo, that need Reformation and Correction? But if ye be ſenſible " of your former *Errors* in ſome things, it is neither *Chriſtian* nor *Manly* to *Creep out* of them " *by ſtealth, contradict* your former *Prints*, as thou and *G. Whitehead* have manifeſtly of late " done, and as I offer fairly to prove in divers things, and yet *wipe your Mouths*, and ſay, ye " are not changed, but are ſtill the ſame, in your Principles and Doctrins ye have formerly " delivered in Print. Sure I am, if your Minds are not changed, your Words and Writings " are, in divers things; and this is yet leſs *Chriſtian*, for it is not ſincere.

" It is a very groundleſs Suppoſition in thee, that what Injury I ſuppoſe thou haſt done " me, might by the Report of ſuch a Meeting, have been repaired, as Credibly as if a great- " er number of Witneſſes. Thou giveſt not the leaſt ſhow of Probability for ſuch a Con- " jecture. And whereas thou askeſt, Is not Prevention better than the Difficulty of a Cure? " The Queſtion at this time of Day is very improper. It had been well, thou and thy " Party had been ſo deliberate, before things had come to this Extreme, as to have endeavou- " red a Prevention, and to have uſed Chriſtian Means to effect it, which ye have not done. " Nothing would ſatisfie you, but that contrary to my Conſcience (and the Conſcience of all " that know you and your Writings) I muſt obey *your moſt Arbitrary and Unjuſt Command*, at " your Yearly Meeting, in the Year, 1694. *To clear the Body of the People, called, Quakers,*

" *and their Miniſtry of thoſe Errors charged upon ſome in* Penſilvania. And unleſs I did obey this, " your unreaſonable Command, (which though ye ſmoothed with the Name of Advice; " *George Whitehead* told me in your hearing, was to be underſtood Command.) I muſt be Ex- " communicated by you, which I chearfully reſolved to ſuffer, and I Reverence Divine Provi- " dence, that permitted you ſo to do; for though your Excommunication was moſt Unjuſt, " yet it was full time for me to depart *out of your* Babylon; and I rejoyce and thank God " that I am come out from it. But for thee to tell of a *Prevention*, after thou with thy " own Hands haſt made ſo deep a *Wound*; is to tell of *Muſtard after Meat*. I ſee no way to " cure the *Wound*, thou and ye have made by your Unjuſt Proceedings; but to *diſſect it* to " the bottom, and lay it open before *Impartial and indifferent Perſons*, ſuch as I believe were " to be found, and which I hope I have found.

" Thou ſeemeſt to make it a great Aggravation in me, how publickly I have *Staged and* " *Condemned you* for the worſt of *Hereticks*, without any limitation of number, or regard to " *Qualifications* of Perſons. But this is no hard Task to Anſwer. Have I Staged you Guil- " ty of *Vile Hereſies and Errors*? Ye have Staged me again, and again, to be an *Apoſtate*, " and given me all the foul Language imaginable, charging me with *Falſhood and Malice*. But " I have not Staged you, out of any Principle of Revenge, or Retaliating Evil for Evil; " what I have charged you with, I am ready to prove againſt you, before any *Impartial and* " *Judicious Auditory*. And it is with a good Conſcience, and from a real Conviction that " ye are Guilty of the things I have charged you; that I have proceeded towards you, nor will " my ſo *Staging* you prove me Faulty; you have Staged others very publickly, from whom " you have differed; and have not only charged them with *Hereſies and Falſe Doctrins*, but *Blaſphe-* " *mies*; and in great part to my late Obſervation, very *Uncharitably* and *Unjuſtly*, and have " loaded them in your Printed Books, with ſuch Names of *Infamy* and *Reproach*, as is a ſhame " to repeat; and none more Guilty of this than *thy ſelf*; as thy own Conſcience, and the " Obſervation of many, who have read thy Books in Controverſie, ſufficiently know. But " thou ſay'ſt amiſs, that I have *Staged you*, without any limitation of Number, or regard to " Qualifications of Perſons. I have *Staged none*, but the Guilty naming the particular Per- " ſons, and their known Abettors, as particularly the *Second Days Meeting*, that hath appro- " ved all your Defaming Books againſt me. I ſtill reſerve a Charity to divers among you, " and greatly bewail that they are ſo Captivated by you, whoſe Bonds I hope and pray for " them to God, that they may be looſed. But what thou meaneſt by *Qualifications* of Perſons, " I do not well know. If thou meaneſt your *Worldly Riches and Greatneſs*; I ſee no juſt rea- " ſon, why your Errors ſhould not be publickly expoſed, and contradicted for all that; as " if ye were *mean* and *low* in the World; Truth has no ſuch reſpect of Perſons, as to paſs " over the Rich, and Cenſure the Poor. How many greater, and better Qualified every " way than your ſelves, have ye fallen ſeverely upon, moſt Uncharitably? Wherein at any " time, I have followed your Uncharitable Example, I Sincerely Repent of it, purpoſing " in the future not to Write after your Copy? But perhaps thou meaneſt, as *G. Whitehead* " Writes in his late Paper he ſent to be Read at *Turner's-Hall*, and was accordingly Read the " 21ſt of the Second Month, 1698. *Ye may not ſo give away your Rights, either as* Engliſh " *Men, or Chriſtians, to his Arbitrary Uſurpation*. But that which ſeems moſt of all to *Nettle* " and *Vex* ſome of you, is, that *George Keith*, a *Stotchman*, (as they deſigned me in their for- " mer *Proteſtation*, 1697.) Should aſſume this Power, to call them to an account for their " Errors; which they think is a *hainous* and *intolerable Uſurpation* upon them, being *Engliſh* " *Men*, and upon their *Liberties* as ſuch. For my being a *Scotch-man*, as I am not aſhamed of " my *Country*; ſo I thank *God Almighty*, and in the next place, I owe great Thankfulneſs " to the *Engliſh* Laws, and the makers of them; who ſince the happy Union of the two Na- " tions, under the King, have made *Scotch-men*, living in *England*, *equally Intereſted* with *En-* " *gliſh* Natives, in the common Liberties of the *Engliſh Nation*. But I ſee not, why without " any *Imputation* of Uſurping a Power over *W. Penn*, and *George Whitehead*; I may not as free- " ly and fully ſpeak and write againſt their Errors, and Publiſh them in Print, as they have " done againſt others, (yea, againſt the Church of *England*, and all others from whom they " Diſſent, with very great Acrimony and Uncharitableneſs) and upon far leſs Occaſions. I " think I am well aſſured, that neither the *Magna Charta*, nor any *of the Fundamental Laws*,

" *or*

" *or Liberties of* England ; *nor the late Act of Parliament, for Tolleration* ; Reſtrain, or Forbid " any Chriſtian Man, to ſtand up in the Defence of the great *Fundamentals of the Chriſtian* " *Religion*, Profeſſed generally by the *Engliſh* Nation, and contained in the three Creeds, ge- " nerally received among Chriſtians. And to employ his Tongue and Pen, and all his Abi- " lities that God has given him, be he *Engliſh* or *Scotch*, or of any *other Nation*, to Detect and " Refute the Contrary Errors, ſo it be done in Truth and in Charity, and without any Breach " of the *Civil Peace* ; as my manner of Oppoſition to your Errors hath always been, and ſo I " hope ſhall be.

" But it more juſtly ſurpriſeth me, (than any occaſion I have given thee of ſurpriſe, for " refuſing thy private Meeting before intereſted Parties) to find thou canſt write and after- " wards permit to Print ſuch a *Broad-fac'd untruth*, that I *Cite you, Arraign and Condemn you*, " without giving you, yea *refuſing you* any ſhare about *Time, Place or Auditory*. It is a great " ſhame for a Man of *W. Penn's* Education and Character in the World, to publiſh ſuch a " notorious untruth. How could I refuſe you that which you never deſired until thy Let- " ter, bearing date, after the third Year's appointment, and long after my two printed Nar- " ratives, of the proceedings of two Meetings at *Turners-Hall*, the one held in 1696, the " other in 1697. And all that time I had not the leaſt Intimation from thee, or any of you, " that ye would accept of any ſhare about appointing Time, and Place, and Auditory? But on " the contrary, Whereas I had, *Short Liſt, &c.* bearing date 26. 3d. Month 1695. in Print deſi- " red, and propoſed my juſt demand to *W. Penn*, to give me an opportunity, and let him " ſignifie to me the *Time and Place*, where he will make it to appear that his Charge againſt " me is true, or retract his falſe Charge ; I never had the leaſt Anſwer from thee all that time, " but inſtead thereof a bantering Anſwer from *T. Elwood*, pretending to vindicate *W. P.* tel- " ling me in Print, that I had effectually proved my ſelf an *Apoſtate*, ſo that there was no " need for *W. Penn* to appoint a Meeting to do it ; and alſo in the Year 1694. I had made " the like former propoſal to *T. Elwood* and his Abettors (of the Second days Meeting and " others) in a Poſtſcript of a Printed Epiſtle, *&c.* allowing him and them to appoint any " *Time and Place*, where I would meet him and them, and prove him guilty of *groſs Forgery* " in Matters of Fact and of *falſe Doctrin*, to which my fair Propoſal, in his *further Diſcovery*, " he gave me a plain refuſal *in print* 1694. Judge now Reader, what hopes or probability I " could have, after ſuch *neglect and refuſal*, that ever they would conſent to ſuch a *Meeting*, " having waited a conſiderable time for their conſent, and leaving it wholly to them, to " appoint *Time and Place*, before indifferent Perſons, before I did nominate any ſuch *Meeting*. " The *injured Perſon* has an undeniable right to call the *injurers* to an account, and require " Satisfaction of them, in the beſt and moſt Chriſtian Method can be found, which I hope I " have done ; leaving the Controverſie betwixt my Adverſaries and me, to *indifferent* and *diſ-* " *intereſted Perſons*.

" And the like palpable *Falſhood* they are guilty of, in their Printed Paper, called, *A Word to* " *the Well-Inclined*, &c. Given in at *Turner's-Hall* to be Read, (and was Read there) that my " *Offers were not*, nor *now is, for Meeting* by Agreement of both Sides. The firſt part of this " Aſſertion is a groſs Untruth ; as what is juſt now above related, doth ſufficiently prove ; " and that I made no ſuch Offer now, for them to agree with me about Time and Place, I " knew (and ſo may every Perſon know, that underſtands their former *Neglects* and *Refu-* " *ſals* to my deſiring them, to agree to, or appoint ſuch a *Meeting*.) It would be in vain " to do it ; I might as ſoon expect the *Greek Calends*, as that they would conſent to ſuch a " Meeting. Thine and their clamouring againſt me, for ſetting up a *Court*, and *Arraigning* " *you*, and giving you no Copy of your *Indictment*, as ye *ſcoffingly word it*, is not worth the " regarding, further than to notice another *Untruth*, Inſinuated both by thee, and them ; that " I gave not thee and them a Copy of my *Charge* againſt you, which ye call your *Indictment*, " the *contrary* whereof as ye know in your Conſciences is *true* ; ſo many know it, who had " Read the *Charges Publiſhed* in Print, before the Reſpective Meetings, for which they were " Printed, for the Years 1696, and 1697. and that the charges are the ſame I told you in " Writ, ſome Weeks before this *laſt Meeting*, 1698. As to thy Queſtions in thy Letter ; " why it is not as reaſonable for thee to propoſe a *Select Meeting*, equally choſen in order to " hear thy *Exceptions* againſt me, after I have in thy Opinion, Injured thee, in order to thy

"Satisfaction? I *Answer*, it is fully as *Reasonable*, and I wish thou hadst done it long before "now, and I intreat thee to do it with thy first Convenience. I hope I shall not decline "thy *Summons*, nor *Meeting*, providing it be before Men of *Christian Principles and Morals*, that "are of neither *Party*, thine, or mine; and to this purpose thou mayest remember I Wrote "to thee, in my Answer to thy first Letter. 2. Whereas thou askest, would I be willing ye "should choose *Arbitrators*, (as I call them) for me, as I have done for you? *Answer*, I "could be willing, providing they be of neither Party, and Men of *Christian Principles and Mo-* "*rals*, any true *Protestants*, but no *Deists*, or otherwise Tinctured with your Vile Errors. The "Case betwixt you and me differs widely; had you consented to come, and brought your *Ar-* "*bitrators* with you, of your own chusing, that had been of *Sound Christian Principles and Mo-* "*rals*, they should have had equal Place and Authority with mine; and therefore by the like "Parity, if any such *Meeting* be appointed by you, I ought to have liberty to chuse my *Arbitra-* "*tors*, as ye have to chuse yours. And I think *W. Penn* in his choice, should as fairly adven- "ture on *Arbitrators* of the Church of *England*, as any others; seeing if I am rightly informed, "he hath declared himself one in Doctrin with the 39 *Articles* of the *Church of England*; except- "ing some few relating to *Discipline, and the Ceremonies*. To thy 3d Question, Would I think "you equal and fair, if (ye were to chuse) to pick out those that have *Prejudged* my Case? I "Answer, Such *Arbitrators* indeed I had among you, at your *Yearly Meetings*, in the Years "1694, and 1695. But I know not that any I had chosen to be my *Arbitrators*, have Prejudged "your Case. Why should thou and ye harbour any such Suspicion against them? The four "Principles of Doctrin, whereof I charge you to be guilty, ye say, ye are not; if ye are not, "but hold them, ye and those *Arbitrators* agree together in them; and why they should be more "*Partial* to me, than to you, I see no reason that thou shouldst suspect. *That believe me*, (thou "sayest) *Erroneous*, and *that are of a Church that has Persecuted me*. I Answer, My Circumstan- "ces and thine are equal in the Case, if ye hold these *four Fundamental Doctrins*, as they do, "though they may think ye Err in lesser Matters, and I also, I see not why thou, or ye should "doubt their *Partiality*; indeed the State of the Controversie betwixt you and me, is so *easily* "*determined*, it being rather Matter of Fact, than of *Dispute*; it can hardly be supposed, that "any Sober and Judicious Men, could be so *Partial*, as to give an Unfair Judgment in the "Case. And though thy *Insinuation* of a *Persecuting Church* might have been spared, there "being no such *Persecuting Church* now, nor do I know any of the *Arbitrators* I have "chosen, that ever did *Persecute*; yet it would rather be an Evidence of Truth, on your "side, that ye could refer it to such. They have a great Advantage, and seem very strong- "ly persuaded of the Truth, that can allow their *Enemies* to be Judges, if otherwise known "to be *Impartial*; as in many Cases it may so happen. However to prevent any Dispute "about the *Qualifications of Arbitrators*, if ye agree to such a Meeting, we ought to have liberty "to choose each our *Arbitrators, judicious and Disinterested Persons*. I choose such *Arbitrators*, be- "ing without all shadow of hope, that ye would take *a share*, either to appoint Time, or "chuse *Arbitrators*. Your Case is hard, when among so many *hundreds of moderate and judicious* "*Persons*; ye cannot pitch upon some, whom ye can trust, to give a true Judgment in Things; "wherein both they and ye agree. If ye had not been *Conscious* of a bad Cause, had ye not dain- "ed to Answer to my *Summons*, as ye please to call it, it is *unaccountable* to all *impartial consi-* "*derate Persons*, why ye should not before this time, have called me to answer to your *Sum-* "*mons*, seeing ye know I was ready to Answer you, at any time; or if ye yet pretend Igno- "rance, *know now* I am ready to Answer *thy Summons*, and *yours* at any time, with *God's Assi-* "*stance*, upon equal Terms, and Liberty granted on both Sides. As for the remaining part of "thy Letter, it being nothing but severe and unjust *Reflexions* against me, charging me, that what "I do, is to be *Revenged* on you, as being guilty of *Hainous Offences*; which being *mere Gene-* "*rals*, without the least Evidence in any *particular*, and my *straying* from the Flock, as thou "terms them; whereas ye *drove me away*; and though it was great *Injustice* in you, yet a *good* "*Providence* it was to me, as it was to many of the *Primitive Protestants*, whom the *Papists* drove "away from them; I find not my self concerned to give any further Reply unto. And as for "the *other Printed Paper*, prefixed to thy Epistle, the Matter of it being much the same; and see- "ing the *Substance* of it, as they say was delivered in Print, at *Turner's-Hall*, the *last Year*, the An- "swer I gave in my former Narrative, and the Printed Answer to their Protestation, called,

"*Some*

"*Some Reflexions*, &c. may, and will ſuffice without need of any more. As to *G. Whitehead's* "*Paper*, in Writing, it is ſo *notoriouſly Impertinent and Idle*, that it were loſs of Time to ſay any "thing further to it, by it ſelf alone, what may ſeem to require any Anſwer, being Anſwered "here, and elſewhere.

London, the 11*th of the* 3*d Month*, 1698.

I remain thy Abuſed Friend,

George Keith.

A Poſtſcript to the READER.

I. SInce the Publication of my former 2 Narratives, many of the People, called, Quakers, have been made to believe that the Quotations I had made out of the Books of their great Teachers, are not truly, nor fairly given, but with ſuch Omiſſions, Alterations, and Perverſions, as render them wholly ineffectual, to prove my Charges againſt them. And *G. Whitehead*, hath twice in Print accuſed me of having wronged him in my Quotations out of ſome of his Books, and *Thomas Elwood* hath moſt ſeverely charged me with Treachery, Falſeneſs, and Fraudulent Dealing in my Quotations; and in like manner, *John Pennington* hath ſerved me; to all whom I have particularly Anſwered, in the foregoing Treatiſe, with reſpect to ſuch Particulars as I did find, and judge needful to be noticed. And this falſe Report, my Adverſaries have been very induſtrious to ſpread againſt me, to poſſeſs not only them of their own way, but any others whom they could influence, that my Quotations are not truly, nor fairly given; and that therefore I am *a Lyar, a Falſe and Treacherous Man, Deceitful and Malicious.* Wherefore that the *Truth* may be cleared, and my *Innocency* (which my Adverſaries have greatly ſought to Stain) vindicated, I thought fit to take this Method of procuring ſome Moderate and Judicious Perſons (Miniſters of the Church of *England*) to examine my Quotations, both old and new; eſpecially ſuch of them as ſeem'd moſt neceſſary for clearing the Truth, and the Vindication of my Innocency. Know therefore, that according to my Requeſt, I have procured certain Miniſters of known Diſcretion and Moderation, to hear and examine my Quotations, by comparing them with the Printed Books, out of which I have gathered them; *whoſe Atteſtation, and moderate Judgment, is before given.* And though in my former Quotations, as given in my two former Narratives, I have delivered

vered them ſufficiently full, to give the true Senſe of them (which is all that can be juſtly required in any that Quotes his Authors) yet in this my third Narrative, I have delivered them generally more full; taking in not only what my Adverſaries Clamoured againſt me, that I had left out, ſo far as I could remember and notice them; but making them ample and large (in a manner) to a degree of Supererogation. And ſome others I had more fully given in my former Narratives, I have now given, more brief, (yet ſufficiently full) that I might not be tedious, and incroach on the Readers Patience. And here in this my third Narrative, the Friendly Reader will find variety of new Matter, by reaſon of many new very conſiderable Proofs I have brought out of their Books, not to be found in the other Narratives, together with great variety of things worthy of notice, and of great uſe, to inform ſuch Readers, not ſo well acquainted with my Adverſaries Evaſions, Quiblings and Shiftings, whereby they ſeek to cover their Errors, as they will perceive by *my Notes and Obſervations*, Printed moſtly in another ſmaller Letter, or otherwiſe ſufficiently diſtinguiſhed from the Quotations by the Marks [ ] or turned Coma's on the Margin, among which Notes and Obſervations ye will find divers Anſwers to the Quibbles and Evaſions of *Thomas Elwood* and *George Whitehead*, in their way of defending their own, and their Aſſociates moſt unſound and ſcandalous Aſſertions. It may be therefore hop'd, that this third Narrative, having the Quotations Atteſted by Perſons of *known Diſcretion and Credit*, will prove effectual to ſilence the unjuſt Clamours of my *Adverſaries* againſt me; or at leaſtwiſe, that all ſuch who are willing to be duly informed, whether called, Quakers, or others, will give a deaf Ear to their continued *unjuſt Clamours*. And I may alſo expect that ſome will be better perſuaded of me, who have been influenced by the falſe Perſuaſions of my Adverſaries, to judge that my ground of Contention with thoſe Men, is a Principle of Prejudice or Revenge, becauſe of the evil Treatment I had from them, and not true Zeal for Chriſtian Doctrin. For by theſe Quotations thus Atteſted, it may ſufficiently appear, there was cauſe enough given to any that had the leaſt degree of true Zeal for the Truth of Chriſt, having the knowledge of theſe Men's Words and Writings (as I of late, after a more diligent ſearch into their Books) have acquired, to appear in this publick way of Oppoſition, to the ſpreading Gangreen of their vile Errors; which have leavened already many thouſands in theſe Nations, and may, if not prevented, leaven many more. And ſeeing the very firſt Riſe of my contending with them, was ſimply and purely my Oppoſition to thoſe very Errors, here charged againſt them; and not any private or perſonal Picque I had with any of them; it is great Uncharitableneſs for any to charge me with any ſuch Principle of Prejudice or Revenge; of which as I have given no Evidence, ſo my Conſcience bears me witneſs to my Innocency. Seeing then my Charges are juſt againſt them, as I hope this third Narrative will further diſcover, and their Clamours and Accuſations are Unjuſt and Falſe againſt me, *the Saddle is ſet on the right Horſe*, and the Names of Infamy they have caſt upon me, as *Lyar, Deceitful, Falſe Accuſer, Fraudulent, Malicious*, return upon themſelves.

That

That which has made it the lighter to me to bear their Revilings and Slanders, is, that it is generally, and almoſt univerſally known throughout theſe Nations, that this is the way they commonly treat all Perſons, however ſo *Innocent* and *Worthy*, that meddle to oppoſe their Errors; ſo that the Proverb may be fitly applyed to them; *Their Tongue is no Slander.*

II. They ſtill continue to make it an Argument of my Inſincerity, that having been ſo long formerly among them, I ſhould but now of late pretend to know that they held ſuch Errors. But to this having formerly Anſwered, and having in readineſs a more full Anſwer to be Printed, in Reply to this invidious Objection; I ſhall ſay the leſs to it now. Only this I ſay, whatever Reflexion it caſts upon my Weakneſs, and want of due Conſideration, to have either joyned, or remained among a Society of People, whoſe Principles I had ſo little known, the which great Weakneſs I do readily acknowledge, and am really aſhamed that I have been ſo long deceived by them; yet it is no Argument of my Inſincerity, or as if I had formerly known them guilty of thoſe vile Errors, but not only connived at them, but had Writ and Printed in Defence of them, contrary to my inward Convincement. This I can no wiſe acknowledge; for whatever knowledge I had of the Ignorance and Unſoundneſs of ſome among them, which I did not diſſemble, or cloak, but upon all occaſions did oppoſe and check, about twenty years ſince, as the Account I have in readineſs to Publiſh will more particularly ſhow; yet I did not know, that either *G. W.* or *W. P.* and many others of their chief Teachers had been guilty of theſe Errors, divers of their Books I having never formerly Read, and ſome never having ſo much as formerly ſeen; and what I have Read was but overly, and in ſmall Parts, and when I happened to find ſome Paſſages that I diſliked, blind Affection ſwayed me to an over-charitable Judgment, eſpecially becauſe I found them in other parts of their Writings, ſeeming ſound upon the ſame Matters, and what ſeemed, or really was contradictory to other unſound Paſſages. And therefore what I found offenſive in their Writings, in ſome Matters I imputed rather to their Inadvertency, than their deliberate Judgment, until their moſt earneſt ſiding with my Adverſaries, who began to oppoſe my Chriſtian Teſtimony in *Penſilvania*, touching theſe *four great Fundamentals*, did ſufficiently awaken me into a more due conſideration of their Aſſertions, and a more diligent Examination of them. But whereas, again, they object againſt me, that the things which I now call vile Errors, and Hereſies in them, I had formerly defended, and had declared, that in my ſo doing, I had a Divine Senſe and Acceptance. To this I Anſwer, firſt, I utterly deny that ever I defended them in any of theſe vile Errors, oppoſing *the four great Fundamental Doctrins of the Chriſtian Religion*, wherewith all I have ſince charged them, or indeed any other Article of the Chriſtian Faith, properly ſo called or diſtinguiſhed. Things wherein I had defended them, being partly in giving the faireſt State of the Controverſie (as I thought) betwixt them and their Oppoſits, in ſeveral Caſes, wherein I thought their Oppoſits had unduly charged them, partly in the undue Uſe and Applications of places of Scriptures, to prove certain

tain Truths (a thing too common to Writers) and partly in too much aggravating and widening (through my too great Heat, and prepoſterous Zeal, and being too bigotly affected, (though ignorantly) to that Party, who call all other *Sects* and *Sectaries*, and themſelves the *Church*, yet are certainly more *bigotted* into a *Sect*, and more implicitly led by Sect-maſters; (the Teachers) among them, than any People in Chriſtendom that I know. And laſtly, I have acknowledged my Sinful Ignorance and Raſhneſs, in oppoſing formerly the Divine Inſtitutions of the outward Baptiſm and Supper, and in all Uncharitableneſs of Judgment, and undue Expreſſions I have uſed in any of my Books, againſt either particular Perſons or Societies. And to Argue with my Adverſaries a little in the Caſe, who ſo object againſt me; that I have formerly defended *the Quakers Principles*, I Query; *What Principles?* Whether Principles oppoſing any of theſe Fundamental Doctrins, which yet they ſeem to deny, and ſay I falſly charge them? If nay, then let them tell me, or the World, what other Principles, or Things I have ever defended them in, beſides what I have already above mentioned.

III. And if through humane Weakneſs (for *humanum eſt errare, labi, decipi.*) I have at times apprehended that to be a divine Senſe, which afterwards having greater Illumination than formerly, and by a more diligent examination, with the help of the Holy Scriptures, diſcovering my miſtake, I found to be an Imagination, will this prove their Point againſt me, That I am what they (falſly) repreſent me to be, an *Apoſtate, gone from all divine Senſe and Tenderneſs, loſt my good Condition, without any inward feeling?* Oh uncharitable Men! Will a miſtake in ſome things infer a Man univerſally miſtaken? Cannot a natural Man that knows no more than bare natural Reaſon, ſee the falſeneſs of their thus arguing againſt me? Becauſe ſome are deceived at times, with ſhows and ſhadows of Reaſon, is therefore no true Reaſon to be found among Men? Will they be content to be judged by their own Rule, and have that meaſured to them which they meaſure to another? Have none of them at any time, even of the moſt Eminent among them, been deceived, and taken their Imagination, for a Divine Senſation? They know in their Conſciences what particular Perſons, of great Note, I could name among them, whom they own were in ſome things miſtaken, which yet they apprehended to be Divine Openings. Did not ſome Eminent among them, even Preachers, ſome of them, from a ſuppoſed divine Senſe, follow the Deluſions and Dreams of *James Nailer* and *John Perrot*? Was it not one of their great Preachers, now living, who led *James Nailer*'s Horſe-bridle, when he was Riding in Proceſſion to *Briſtol, Samuel Cater by Name*, as is known to himſelf and many? Was that a Divine Senſe in *G. F.* who writ in a Paper, That I ſaw and read, (and was grieved with, many years ago) that his Marriage with Widow *Fell*, was a Figure of the Church coming out of the Wilderneſs, and that the Figure might be Completed, they both, and others that believed their Deceptions did ſtrongly conclude that ſhe was with Child, though long before, ſhe was paſt the Age of Child-bearing,

ring, being then Aged upwards of ſixty years, therefore they did reckon it was miraculous. Other great Inſtances can be given of their more wild Deceptions, than (I thank God) ever any can give of mine, who (notwithſtanding of divers Miſtakes I was under) yet as to the main, I was through God's great Mercy and Grace, preſerved. And the true Divine Senſe and Feeling I formerly had, when among them, (though not of them, neither of their Erroneous Principles, nor Spirit in the greater things) God having a regard to the Simplicity and Sincerity of Heart, that was his own Work in me, and being Merciful to me for Chriſt's Sake) I ſtill own, and I hope I never ſhall have cauſe to diſown. But what a ſad Inference doth this their way of Arguing againſt me, make againſt themſelves? Who generally in their Books, containing their vileſt Errors, father them all upon the Spirit of Truth, according to their ſuppoſed inward Senſe of the ſame. Thus they *Hedge* up their Way, and *Baricado* themſelves againſt all diſcovery and acknowledgment of their Errors, in more or leſs; or otherwiſe by their own Arguing they muſt turn Apoſtates. Is it Apoſtacy to turn from Error to Truth? Or ſuppoſe I, or another ſhould through Human Frailty ſlide into ſome Errors, not oppoſing any Fundamental Article of the Chriſtian Faith; can this be called Apoſtacy? Therefore this Uncharitableneſs is extreamly great againſt me, to render me an Apoſtate, whom they cannot prove guilty of departing from any Truth of Chriſt, that ever I held; but on the contrary, I have through God's Mercy forſaken the Errors wherewithall I was formerly Stained, while among them; though the worſt, of their Errors I was never tainted with. And they are as idle in Arguing, how unlikely it is, that I could be thirty Years among them, and not know their Principles? For ſeeing they mean, *as they are a Body of People*; how could I know their Principles, or any body elſe? Seeing as a Body of People, they have no Principles; being declared Enemies to all Creeds or Forms of Words giving an account of their Faith, which every particular Member of their Society ought publickly to profeſs; and without which, it is impoſſible without Miracles, that they can know what Faith the Body of their People have; never any Confeſſion of Faith having yet been univerſally received by them. But they continue to cloak their Unbelief and vile Errors, with the general, that the Scripture is the Confeſſion of their Faith; and ſo ſay commonly the worſt of Hereticks; but it is a great deceit, to ſay the Scripture is the Confeſſion of their Faith; when the contrary is evidently apparent, as my ſeveral Narratives do prove to all Impartial Readers. And as for the Accounts of their Faith, given by their ſeveral Writers, and by the ſame Writers at ſeveral times; they are ſo contradictory and inconſiſtent, that no Man can gather any thing of what they hold for certain, as concerning the great Fundamentals of Chriſtianity. Whereof many Inſtances can be given, eſpecially if any will be at the pains to examine the contradictory Paſſages in *G. W.*'s former Books; as that called, *The Light and Life*, *Truth Defending the Quakers*, *Chriſt Aſcended*, &c. And his late *Antidote*; though even in this laſt he hath ſufficiently ſhewed his *Deiſme*, and other *Unchriſtian Aſſertions*. And alſo to Exa-

mine *W. Penn*'s former Books (not to mention his Sandy Foundation) as his *Reason against Railing*, His *Answers to* J. Faldo, His *Christian Quaker*, *Address to Protestants*, and compare them with his late *Primitive Christianity*, though still greatly Erroneous. And whether in that great Article of the Christian Faith, that Christ hath *our Nature* in Heaven; shall *E. Burrough* be rather believed, and *G. Whitehead*, or *W. Penn*? I suppose the more Zealous Quakers, who look much to Antiquity, will say *Edward Burrough*, and *G. Whitehead*, are more to be received in giving the Account of the Quakers Faith, than *W. Penn*, who is much latter. Well; But W. *Penn* hath delivered it, that Christ took our *Nature*, *in Pr. Chr. p.* 85. and that it is the Quakers Faith, as a People to believe this. But both *G. Whitehead*, and *E. Burrough*, have earnestly opposed it; and *E. Burrough* hath charged it to be Wickedness and Blasphemy in *John Bunion*, for affirming that Christ is in Heaven in *our Nature*; is not this a plain Contradiction? Unless W. *Penn* think to Reconcile the Matter, by distinguishing the *Quakers Nature* from *John Bunion*'s *Nature*, and the *Nature* of all other Men, who are not Quakers, *viz.* That the Quakers *Nature is Divine and Heavenly*; but the *Nature* of *J. Bunion, and other Men is Sinful, and Earthly, or Humane.* And if this Distinction be their Sense, it is no wonder that so many Men at this day, have been deceived by their Gross Equivocations; and this I hope will enough make an Apology, though not for my Weakness, yet for my Simplicity, while among them. It was so far well, that I knew what true Principles of Faith I held, though I knew not the Depths of Satan that were among others.

IV. But they upbraid me with the fewness of the People called Quakers that own me. What then? Will that prove me to be a bad Man, or them to be Saints? *Mahomet* and the Pope have many more Followers than either *G. Whitehead* or *W. Penn*, but I have more that love me, and own my Christianity, even owned by them, or at least not denyed to be in the Unity, than they know, or perhaps think of, whom I spare to name, or mention to them, lest I should gratifie their Rage and Fury against them. They cannot, I think, deny, but some that were reckoned in the Unity, drew up that Paper in my vindication against *T. E.* that was read at *Turner's-Hall* Meeting, the 1st. of the 4th. Mo. 1695. and is printed in my first Narrative: And beside, divers of as good Fame and Credit, as any among them, both own my Christianity, and my Christian Testimony, by coming constantly to our Meeting at *Turner's Hall*, (some Hundreds in *Pensilvania*, and other Parts of *America*, that remain owning me and my Christian Testimony.) And to cast the Ballance, what-ever number they have of them, called Quakers or Friends in the Unity, as they call it, if it were worth the while so to argue, as it is not (for multitude and fewness neither make a Man, or his way right nor wrong) I doubt not, but I can find ten to one, in City and Country, of true Christians and Protestants, that when the Case of my Adversaries and mine is fairly stated before them, will own my Christianity before that of my Adversaries; and for Morality and Honesty of Life and Con-

Converſation (thanks be to God) I may compare with any of them; for could they have found a flaw in that, no doubt the World ſhould have heard of it long 'ere now. I would have made no compariſon in the Caſe, but that after the Example of other honeſt Men (they having by their baſe revilings compelled me) I am neceſſitated thus to vindicate my Chriſtian Name and Reputation, chiefly for the Truth's ſake, which they ſeem to reproach and wound through my Sides.

V. But I am ſo contemptible in their Eyes, they do not think it worth while to notice my Meetings at *Turners-Hall*, where I call them to account for that I judge to be Erroneous in them. But, why then give they in, ſo many Papers againſt me at thoſe Meetings? Can they do all this without noticing me? And why are they in ſuch a Flame? And why ſo alarm'd, as if their All were at ſtake with them? And why ſuch hideous out-cries and belchings forth againſt *one ſingle Man*, whom they know not that any body regards or values? And why have they Printed ſo many Books againſt me, if they count me nothing worthy of their noticing? They boaſt that they have anſwered me, and followed me from Step to Step, leaving nothing material unanſwered, which, they ſay, they take to be the fairer, more ſubſtantial, and edifying Method. But this is indeed ſaid but very untruly, and contrary to what ſome of them know in their Conſciences, viz. *that they have left nothing material unanſwered*; they had ſaid far more true, that they have anſwered nothing material, but generally in their Anſwers from firſt to laſt, have given me ſtill greater and greater advantage againſt them, and occaſion to ſhew their Ignorance and Error. Beſide, they have given no ſhadow of Anſwer, that ever I heard of, to my ſecond Narrative, Printed in the Year 1697. and which has been above a year out in Print, which contain altogether (almoſt) new Proofs, beſide thoſe given in my firſt Narrative. And the Anſwer given to *Th. Ellwood's* Reply to my firſt Narrative, called *Satan Diſrob'd*, which I own, ſo far as it concerns the Controverſie betwixt my Adverſaries and me, and diſcovers *T. Ellwood's* Ignorance, and impertinent and nonſenſical Quibbles and Evaſions, and wherein the Author hath done me a great deal of Juſtice, as well as in the *Snake in the Graſs*, (however in ſome other things, there and elſewhere mentioned, I differ from him) and for which I owe him great thanks and reſpect. To the Second Book, called *Satan Diſrob'd* (which ſaved me the Labour of anſwering *T. Ellwood's* Reply to my firſt Narrative) they have given no Anſwer, except a few Pages that *G. W.* hath given in his *Antidote*, containing a few Quibbles and Evaſions, as his manner is. My large Reply to *Samuel Jennings's* Book of Falſhoods, they have ſaid nothing to. And now my Book concerning Baptiſm and the Supper, with a large Appendix againſt *W. Penn*, and *John Pennington*, was publiſhed in Print before the laſt Meeting at *Turners-Hall*, which proves that it is a notorious Falſhood that they publiſh in Print, in that they call *A Word to the Well-inclin'd*, &c. That they leave nothing material of what I have Printed againſt them, unanſwered. Indeed their beſt and

ſtrongeſt Armour whereby they fight againſt me are Lyes and Falſhoods, wherewith, I confeſs, they have greatly prevailed with the poor benighted People, that take their Words for Oracles, and generally, with their Lyes and Falſhoods, they have got the Victory they boaſt of, over moſt Sorts of Adverſaries that have dealt with them, which is a diſhonourable Victory.

VI. But that they ſay, they take Printing to be the *fairer, more ſubſtantial, and edifying Method.* In their Caſe it is neither fair, nor ſubſtantial, nor edifying, though by the unjuſt and undue Credit they have got over the ſilly Sheep that implicitly believe them, or any others that through Partialty and Intereſt favour them, it hath proved advantageous to their wrong Cauſe, and diſadvantageous to my right Cauſe in ſome reſpects, chiefly becauſe they have ſo taught their People, that though they will read their Books, yet they will not touch (many, or of moſt them) with what is writ, to diſcover and detect their Errors, more than as if it were to Eat Poyſon. Secondly, Becauſe much of my late Controverſies with them, depend on Quotations out of their Books, which my Adverſaries ſay are falſe, and not to be credited. Now the Books out of which I have gathered my Quotations, many have none of them, others few of them; and ſome of theſe Books being old, are but rare to be found, which make a Controverſie of this ſort, by Printing only, very advantageous to ſupport their Sandy Foundation of Falſhoods and Untruths, and the more diſadvantageous to my right and juſt Cauſe, becauſe many (perhaps of others, who are not Quakers) who would be willing to look into the truth of the Quotations, have not the Books out of which the Quotations are taken, and know not how to have them, others who can have them, yet care not to be at the pains to have them, or ſo much as read them. Therefore, ſuch a Meeting as I propoſed, and twice before this laſt Meeting had, is the *more fair, ſubſtantial,* and *edifying*, but exceeding diſadvantageous and fatal it would be to them, ſhould they come orderly and duly to hear the Quotations Read out of their own Books, they could have no Cloak, nor device to cover their bare-fac'd Errors, but would be publickly expoſed to Shame and Contempt, before all preſent indifferent Perſons. Hence it is that they ſo much dread, ſhun, and avoid, and uſe all the little Arts imaginable to excuſe their not coming to ſuch a Meeting; nor are they ever like to be willing to appoint ſuch a Meeting of their own accord, where They and I can be fairly and orderly heard to Diſcouſe things of Difference betwixt us, before indifferent judicious Perſons. Therefore this new Method that I now have taken in this laſt Meeting, is like to prove the more effectual for the diſcovery of their Errors, the vindication of the Truth, and my Innocency: For, the *Atteſtation* being given by *Perſons* of *worthy Credit*, to the truth and fairneſs of my Quotations, there is no queſtion but all true Chriſtians, who ſhall have the occaſion to read them, even ſuch as are but weak in Judgment, as well as the more able, will be ready to give their free Sentiment in the Caſe, that the Quotations do moſt vilely and wretchedly oppoſe theſe Four great Fundamentals.

VII.

VII. That they call me the *Epitome and very Common-place of all the preceeding Adverſaries*, with other vile and abuſive Names, is but like themſelves and ſome part of that Poiſon of Aſps, that they have ſpewed out of their venomous Hearts, from the Infection of which, I pray God preſerve me and all good Chriſtian People; and that, if it pleaſe God, he may give them a ſenſe of their great Sin of Uncharitableneſs towards me, and true Repentance and Forgiveneſs of the ſame, who hate me, and count me their Enemy *for telling them the truth*, and ſeeking ſincerely to reduce them from their Errors to the Truth; the Succeſs of which my ſincere Labours I commit to Almighty God, with whom I leave my Righteous Cauſe, and in whoſe Mercy I truſt, through Jeſus Chriſt, that he will preſerve me in Soul and Body, from being a Sacrifice to their Fury and Rage: Only at laſt pleaſe to take notice Reader, what Hypocriſie theſe Men are Guilty of, who have ſo exceedingly blamed me for hard words, and yet have imcomparably, and beyond all Bounds exceeded me far.

GEORGE KEITH.

A Letter to George Whitehead, *in Anſwer to his*, London *the* 3d. *of the* 3d. *Month*, 1698.

George Whitehead,

'THou mayſt remember, that the ſame day of the Month after thou and 'others gave out your falſe Sentence of Excommunication againſt me, 'thou ſent me (in a Letter) a Prophetical Curſe, viz. *And thus ſaith the 'Lord, Becauſe thou haſt poured out great Contempt, Scorn, and Reproach upon 'my Servants and People, I will aſſuredly pour out and bring great Contempt and 'Confuſion upon thee*, Signed, *George Whitehead.* And that thy Propheſie 'might be fulfilled, the ſame Spirit in thee which gave it forth, hath poured 'out a great Flood of Contempt upon me in thy late Letter; but this ſeems 'to be but a part of a great deal more thou haſt yet behind in thy foul Bottle 'to pour forth. And that this Spirit that has thus acted thee cannot be 'the Spirit of God, is very evident by the Fruits of it, which are manifeſtly evil; even ſuch bitter words, as are not poſſible to come from the Spirit of Truth, when no juſt occaſion is given, as indeed I have not given 'thee; for all thy offence againſt me, is for giving the Nation a true and 'fair proſpect of Thine and thy Brethrens Errors, contradicting ſome great 'Fundamentals of the Chriſtian Faith, as I have formerly done in my two 'former Narratives and other Books; and yet have more fully done in my 'third Narrative; and I have inward Peace and Satisfaction in my Conſcience, that my end is good in ſo doing; that the truth of things may be 'made manifeſt, and, if poſſible, ſome of thoſe many Thouſands whom thou

and

'and thy Brethren have led into the Ditch, may be recovered, and thy self 'together with them; but if otherwise, that others may be prevented from 'falling into your Snares. And doth this my so Honest End and Intention, 'deserve such Treatment of vile Words and Language? As where thou sayest 'to me. 1. Great Contempt is already come upon thee. 2. The Lord's 'Power will hedge up thy way, and frustrate thy Designs of Malice and Mis-'chief. 3. Set Bounds to thy Rage and Fury. 4. By thy wheedling Insinu-'ations, *&c.* Thou hast shamefully debased thy self, and laid thy self flat under 'the Priest's Feet, for their Aid, *&c.* [This is a manifest Calumny, did '*G. W.* lay 'himself flat under his moderate Church-man's Feet, that takes part with him in 'his vile Errors, *E. El.* by Name, and some other Deists?] 5. The Lord's Power 'is turned against thee, and will smite thee and fall heavy upon thee for thy 'perfidious Apostacy, and base temporising to 'gratifie our † open Adversaries and Persecu-'tors. 6. *He saith further, thus to me*; Oh 'wandring Star, how art thou fallen! 7. O 'raging Wave, how art thou tossed! 8. How 'foully and wickedly hast thou Aspersed and 'Defamed us? 9. God will certainly Judge 'thy Insincerity, Deceit and Falshood. '10. Thou hast miserably plaid the Fool. '11. Discovered thy malicious Madness in thy open Fury and publick Cla-'mours. 12. And thy self and Family may come further to suffer by thy Folly 'and Ingratitude. 13. And such a Day of Distress may come upon thee as thy 'Confederates, Abettors and Supporters *may* fail thee, and not be able to Sup-'port and Relieve thee from the Just Hand of God. [*Note the uncertain 'manner of this thy Prophecy: 'Did ever any of the Prophets 'say such things might come? 'If thou pretends to no Prophecy 'here, it's but thy fallible Spirit, 'which I need not regard, as I 'bless God I do not, either in 'this, or any of the rest*] '13. *Be it known to thee, 'if I were of such a revengful 'Temper, (as thou hast sug-'gested) I could further expose 'thee to thy *Terror* and *Shame*, 'than ever I have done, This 'is but a part of what 'thou hast poured forth out 'of thy foul Bottle against me, 'and

† *Seeing* G. Whitehead *glorieth that the* Government *hath Recognized the* Quakers *to be* Protestants, *and that generally they in the Government are of the Church of* England; *whether they that have so Recognized them, (if* G. W. *say true) deserve this Character of open Adversaries and Persecutors.*

* *Seeing* G. Whitehead *threatens me with what he can do, to expose me to my* Terror and Shame, *I reckon I have just Cause to require him; and hereby I do require him to let me know what the* Terror and Shame *is he Threatens me with. There is nothing, (I thank God) wherein he can justly expose me, either to* Terror or Shame; *if he thinks he can, he ought in Justice to do it, seeing in Justice I require it of him; and let him do it as Publickly as he pleaseth, I fear him not. If he doth it not, he gives cause of Suspicion, that he means some bodily Harm, or otherwise some Injury to my good Name; therefore it concerns him to be plain, or else he will give occasion for peaceable Neighbours to conclude him Turbulent and a dangerous unpeaceable Man in the Realm. If he means that he and his Brethren may Sue me at Law for Defaming them, and that this would expose me to my* Terror and Shame; *I fear not the Issue, seeing my Innocency is not only known to my self, but is generally known throughout the Nation.*

'and by the Savour of it, Men may eaſily judge of the Nature and Quality of 'it. If thou Print thy Letter, thou mayſt have a particular Anſwer to all thy par-'ticular Charges; only I think fit at preſent to notice ſome Particulars therein, 'to detect thy Injuſtice and my Innocency.

I. 'Thou ſeverely blameſt me for ſubmitting my Explications (in my late 'Book, called, *My Explications*, &c.) to the Friendly and Judicious Reader; 'that if any of them *but* ſeem to him in any degree ſtrained, and if what the 'Reader does but think in any degree ſo ſtrained, he may take it, if not for a 'genuine and proper Explication, (if ſo be it is in the leaſt inconſiſtent with 'the Truth of Holy Scripture) to be my plain and free Retractation; thou 'addeſt, would'ſt not be thought a very humble minded Perſon, for ſuch im-'plicit Submiſſion to thy Readers thoughts! What implicit Faith is this thou 'art fallen into? *Anſ.* Firſt, Thou wrongs not only my words, but the Senſe 'of them, by adding to ſeem, *but* ſeem, and to think, *but* think giving thy 'falſe and uncharitable Senſe to my Chriſtian and humble Saying; as if the 'Reader do *but* think that my Explication is in any degree ſtrained, though it 'be *but* a *Thought*, without all juſt ground for his ſo thinking or judging; 'whereas I had thus required my Reader to be qualified. 1. That 'he be Judicious: 2. That he be enabled ſo to do, *by a Divine Illumation.* '3. That my Explication given, is not in the leaſt inconſiſtent with the Truth of 'the Holy Scripture; where I did ſuppoſe, that ſome things in that Book, might 'be inconſiſtent therewith, (though I know not any ſuch.) Now if this is 'blame worthy in me, according to thy judgment and thy Brethrens, ye muſt 'not ſubmit any thing ye write to the Judicious Reader, (whoever, be he 'one of your Brethren, or any other; and though he be enabled by a Divine 'Illumination, to give a Judgment in the Caſe. But this is contrary to thy 'Allowance, in a Caſe, whereint thou haſt groſly Erred, as in thy *Light 'and Life*, p. 4. Thou ſayeſt, let the Reader Judge. *Secondly*, It is contrary 'to the common Practice of the Writers among the Quakers, even the chiefeſt 'of them, who ſubmit their Books, (before they be Printed) to the Miniſters 'of the Second Days Meeting, who oft both put out, and put in, and greatly 'change Words and Senſe in Books that are brought before them, and ſome-'times ſtop the Printing of ſome Books that the Author has thought he writ from 'a Divine Motion. And is it not intolerable Pride, and high Conceit of thy 'Infallibility, that thou blameſt my yielding, that I will Retract an Explica-'tion, if ſo be it is in the leaſt inconſiſtent with the Truth of the Holy Scrip-'ture; for ſo my words were, and ſo thou Quotes me; I did not ſay, if ſo be 'it, *but* ſeemed; or if ſo be the Reader did *but* think that it contradicted the 'Truth of the Holy Scripture, but that it really did ſo, and that the Reader 'were enabled to Judge ſo, and Correct me by a Divine Illumination; from 'which words of thine theſe three things neceſſarily follow. 1. That what 'thou haſt Writ, though it be inconſiſtent with the Truth of the Holy Scrip-'ture; yet thou wilt not Retract or Correct it. 2. Nor though it contradict 'the Judgment of the Reader, who is enabled to Correct it by a Divine Illu-

'mi-

'Illumination. 3. That thy Divine Illumination may contradict both the Scrip-
'ture, and the Divine Illumination of another laying claim to it, as much as
'thy self.

II. Thou positively and expresly sayest, (but most falsly and presumptuously,)
'that their (*i. e.* the Quakers) not observing those outward Practices and Sha-
'dows, (*viz.* Of the *outward Baptism and the Supper*) hath sprung and risen
'from a true *Faith* in them of Christ Crucified, and thereby ending that, and
'introducing *an higher Dispensation*; and thou art wonderfully offended at me
'for saying, that it hath pleased God to give me to see, that the Spring and Rise
'of that great Opposition, that hath been, and is in many, against these out-
'ward Practices, hath been, and is *secret Prejudice* against the *Doctrin of Christ*
'*Crucified*, &c. *Ans.* Whether I have not sufficiently proved this to be true;
'I desire the Readers to consider what I have said in my late Printed Treatise
'of *Baptism*, &c. And the Proofs that I have brought, that are both in
'that Treatise, and in my 3d Narrative.

III. 'Thou say'st I have shamefully abused and belyed thee; (but this thou
'say'st without any Proof) as well as basely and treacherously broke Promise.
'*First*, That I would not expose thee in Print for former Kindness. *Secondly*,
'That though some of your Books needed Correcting, or some Emendation,
'as well as mine, yet I would not Correct any of them as an Enemy, but as a
'Friend. Thou addest. But hast thou not notoriously broke and violated these
'and other Covenants with God and his People? *Ans.* That ever I made an
'absolute promise in the Case, I utterly deny, and my Word among Impartial
'Men, will I hope be of as good Credit as thine; and suppose I had said to thee,
'I would not expose thee in Print; doth this prove or infer any absolute Pro-
'mise or Covenant? I say nay, and I appeal to judicious Persons, whether
'it doth? All Resolutions, or simple Declarations of ones Mind or Purpose,
'are not absolute Promises; otherwise thou mightest charge some of God's Ho-
'ly Angels, as well as Holy Men, with breach of Promise; and Circumstances
'may happen, that may make such sort of declared Resolutions or Pur-
'poses, being changed, so far from being culpable, that the change of them
'is not only commendable, but necessary, and thy own words entangle and
'ensnare thee wofully in this very Case, that thou sayest I have broke my Co-
'venants with God and his People. For first, I never made it any part of my
'Covenant with God, never, or in no case to expose *G. W.* and his Brethrens
'Errors, nor yet any part of any Covenant with any of the Quakers; indeed
'the Quakers in respect of any Church-membership, reject all outward Cove-
'nants, and of inward Covenants, (for all their high Pretences) they are not
'proper Judges. But how could I be bound by Covenant with *G. Whitehead*
'and his Brethren, and he and they not bound to me? That's impossible,
'for all Covenants do mutually bind and imply a necessary Obligation of Fi-
'delity in both Parties, which is oft Conditional, sometimes expressed, and
'oft understood and implyed. Now let *G. W.* tell me what was thine and
'your Covenant with me? And how have ye kept it, that simply for my

op-

'oppoſing the vile Errors of ſome, called, Quakers, in *Penſilvania*, did Excom-
'municate me, which was a manifeſt Breach of Covenant, if ever ye did
'underſtand any Covenant betwixt you and me, ſo much as virtual, for
'I am ſure, a formal Covenant never was betwixt us. The Caſe it ſelf
'beſpeaks, that what I ever ſaid to thee, in Relation to the not expoſing
'thy Errors in Publick, was ſimply Conditional, *viz.* Providing thou wouldſt
'Correct them thy ſelf, or ſuffer me to Correct them in as gentle a way as I
'could, while thou and I remained in External Communion, and my ſaying,
'(as thou alledgeſt my Words) that I would not Correct any of your Books,
'as an Enemy, but as a Friend, doth plainly imply that I declared my Inten-
'tion to Correct them, and that publickly, as ſome late Chriſtian Writers had
'Corrected the Errors of *Auguſtine* and other Ancients; this Example thou
'confeſſeſt I uſed; and therefore in my publick Correcting your Errors, I have
'not contradicted ſo much as my declared firſt Reſolution. And though ſince
'your Excommunicating me, I have not regarded you as my Chriſtian Bre-
'thren and Friends in that ſpecial Bond of Chriſtian Fellowſhip, becauſe of your
'great Injuſtice done towards me, which I cannot in Charity think any true
'Church of Chriſt would have done, and alſo becauſe of your vile Errors,
'which I came much more to the knowledge of, ſince my Excommunication,
'than before, and your great Obſtinacy in perſiſting in them, yet in a gene-
'ral way I retain a true Friendſhip towards you, and judge it the beſt Act of
'Friendſhip I can extend to you, to oppoſe your Errors, and labour to convince
'you of the ſame: And though ye ſay I have not done it in love, yet of that ye
'are not proper Judges; but God who ſearcheth my Heart; and I ſay and be-
'lieve I have done it in love, and I know my Heart better than ye, ſeeing ye can
'give no External Evidence of my Words or Deeds that I do not love you;
'thou and thy Brethren ſay I have belyed you, and falſly accuſed you, but ye
'have not yet proved it, nor I think ever can. But again, Dare thou ſay, that
'thou never declared thy Intention or Purpoſe; (ſince thou was a Quaker) to
'any Man, or Men, that thou wouldſt not do a thing, and yet afterwards did
'it, on ſome further Conſideration, or more natural Deliberation on ſome
'change of weighty Circumſtances? if yea, then by thy own Argument thou
'was Treacherous, and broke thy Covenant with that Man, or Men, to whom
'thou ſo ſaid; if nay, it is a rare Caſe, and not ordinary; for ſurely, ſome as
'good Men, and better, have at times done it; yea, God himſelf, who is in
'every reſpect Unchangeable, and whoſe Purpoſes are (like himſelf) Unchange-
'able, is ſaid to have done it in Scripture; becauſe what he had ſo ſaid, (without
'any change in him) had a Condition underſtood, though not expreſſed;
'Read and conſider 1. *Sam.* 2. 30. *I ſaid indeed, that thy houſe, and the houſe of*
'*thy Father ſhould walk before me for ever; but now the Lord ſaith, be it far from*
'*me; for them that honour me, I will honour, and they that deſpiſe me ſhall be light-*
'*ly eſteemed.* And laſtly, as to this preſent caſe; ſeeing thou haſt confeſſed in
'this very Letter, that I ſaid I would Correct thy Errors and thy Brethrens, as
'ſome latter Writers had Corrected *Auguſtin*'s Errors, and that I ſaid this be-
'fore I was Excommunicated, and which I well remember was near a whole

'Year before my Excommunication; this by thy own confeſſion doth clear 'me before Impartial Judges, that it was not Revenge in me, upon the Of-'fence of your Excommunication, that hath moved me to Correct your Errors; 'but my Zeal to Truth, and that as publickly as ſome good Men have Correct-'ed *Auguſtin*'s Errors; but with this difference, that I know not that ever *Au-'guſtine* had any Error to be Corrected, that did oppoſe any Fundamental 'Truth of Chriſtianity, as I have found that thou and ſome of thy Brethren 'have had ſuch Errors as oppoſe divers Fundamental Truths of the Chriſtian 'Faith, which I cannot find that ye are willing to acknowledge, but very In-'ſincerely ſeek to cover and hide to this Day.

IV. 'Thou wilt not allow me to excuſe my Omiſſion of *Blood and Bones* af-'ter *Fleſh*, in one of my Quotations out of *Chriſt Aſcended*, as being an *Omiſſi-'on* either in the Printer or Tranſcriber, and as no deſigned Omiſſion, and in-'deed nothing Material to either, to excuſe thee, or argue my Inſincerity. 'And to prove my Inſincerity, thou argueſt from thy own great Inſincerity, 'and ſeekeſt to abuſe both thy Reader and me. Thou ſayeſt I have the like Omiſ-'ſion, of the ſame, and more material words in my firſt Narrative, p. 16. 17. '*Anſ.* I have read and conſidered again, and again, both p. 16 and 17. And I 'find not that particular Quotation, nor ſo much as any part of that ſhort 'Sentence referred to in any of the Pages Cited by thee. And therefore to a-'buſe both the Reader and me, thou haſt invented this Fiction, and thereupon 'moſt unjuſtly and bitterly accuſeſt me that I have deceitfully wronged thee, 'and I offer at any convenient time to meet thee before Impartial Judges, 'to have the Quotation examined; that the Abuſe or Lye wherewith thou 'chargeſt me, may be found out, whether thine or mine. Muſt, or can that 'be called an Omiſſion of a part of a Sentence, when the Sentence is not at all 'Quoted, as in the preſent Caſe? Then no Author can be clear of Blame in 'his Quotations. But Impartial Men will ſay, the Quoter has his liberty to 'Quote what he pleaſeth in his Author, providing he take not away, or omit 'not any neceſſary part of the Sentence he Quotes, that is needful to give the 'Author's true Senſe, as I have not done: Thy alledging my interfering with 'my ſelf is the like Abuſe, and which I have above anſwered in my third Nar-'rative.

V. 'I take notice of thy Confeſſion, where in the latter part of thy Letter, 'thou ſayeſt thou confeſſeſt thou haſt been too ſhort and dubious in 'ſome Words or Expreſſions, as not fully explained in ſome former Writings, 'which may be eaſily helped by ſome Ingenuous and Charitable Explications 'or Emendations. *Anſ.* 1. This is more than ever I yet heard, or received 'either from thy Mouth or *Pen*, and I am glad of this thy Confeſſion, and I 'wiſh it were Sincere. 2. If ſome of thy Words and Expreſſions in thy for-'mer Writings were too ſhort and dubious, and may be helped by ſome Inge-'nuous Explications or Emendations; Didſt thou Write thoſe too ſhort and 'dubious Words or Expreſſions that need Emendation; (which is the ſame in 'Signification with Correction and Retractation) from the Infallible Spirit?

'I hope

'I hope thou dares not ſay yea, and if thou ſayeſt nay, then thou wantedſt In-'fallibility in thy ſo Writing thoſe Words, and by thy own Words and Argu-'ment againſt *T. Danſon*, thou art no Miniſter of Chriſt; for thou ſayeſt to 'him, *the want of Infallibility proved him and his Brethren to be no Miniſters of* '*Chriſt*; and *G. Fox* ſaid, whoever ſpeaks a word, and not from the Mouth of 'the Lord, is a Witch and Conjurer. 3. Why has *T. Elwood* in all his Printed 'Scriblings againſt me, juſtified thee intirely in all the Quotations I have pro-'duced out of thy former Writings, in his Anſwer to my firſt Narrative, and 'other Books, and why doſt thou Connive at, or Abet him in his ſo doing? Are 'none of theſe Quotations juſtified by him, ſuch as contain ſome of theſe too 'ſhort and dubious words that need emendation; that is to ſay, Correction and 'Retractation; and whereas thou ſayeſt they may be eaſily helped by ſome 'Ingenuous and Charitable Explications or Emendations. Yes, as eaſily as 'if one ſhould ſay, we are not to believe in God without us, but *only* in God 'within us; the Amendment is ſo eaſie in the words, that take but away the 'word *only* in the ſecond part, and add the word *alſo*, and add or remove the 'word *only* to the firſt part, and it will make an Emendation that is good, and 'yet the Senſe quite oppoſit; and as great an Emendation thy words need, 'where thou haſt ſaid, it's contrary to Scripture, to ſay we are to confide in 'Chriſt without us, or that Men are to be directed to Jeſus Chriſt, as he Suffer-'ed at *Jeruſalem*, or as he is in Heaven without us, above the Clouds, for Juſti-'fication? 4. Why then haſt thou and thy Brethren judged me an Apoſtate 'and double minded Man, and Unſtable, for making ſome Emendations and Re-'tractations in my former Writings, ſeeing thou confeſſeſt thy words, ſome 'of them may be helped by ſome Emendations? And let but a Tryal be made 'before Impartial Perſons, I queſtion not, but it ſhall appear thy Writings, 'both former and latter, need much more Emendations than any of mine, 'and that there are incomparably more foul Eſcapes and Miſtakes in thine, 'than in mine. 5. And why all this time, thou haſt not Publiſhed thy Ingenu-'ous and Charitable Emendations that would be of great Service, both for 'thy own good, if ſincerely done, and for the good of many Hundreds which 'have been ſadly hurt and darkned by thy not only dubious, but moſt unſound 'words in many of thy Books.

VI. 'That thou ſayeſt the moſt material Paſſages by me objected againſt 'thee and other Friends in my Narratives, *&c.* Are in Subſtance Vindicated 'and Defended by me in my Books, eight whereof thou only nameſt by their 'Titles, but giveſt not ſo much as one Proof out of any of them. I Anſwer, 'This is but a bare Allegation, and at moſt an Equivocation. In moſt of thoſe 'Books, I do not ſo much as name thee, and where I have named thee in any 'of my Books, I utterly deny, and put thee to prove that ever I did vindicate 'thee in any of the things I have charged on thee, to be Erroneous. In my *Seri-*'*ous Appeal*, and perhaps elſe where, through my want of ſuch a knowledge of 'thee as was needful, and which I have ſince much more received, than for-

'merly

'merly, I did too much vindicate thee and *W. Penn* alſo upon my Miſtake, and 'want of a right knowledge of you, I was really deceived by you, as con-'cerning your Principles, which I hope I ſhall in time convenient further diſco-'ver, thinking that ye held Sincerely the Principles which now I have found 'by a more diligent ſearch into your Books ye held not; and ſo far only as 'here and there I hit on ſome ſeemingly ſound Paſſages in your Books, there-'by judging ye were Uniform and Conſiſtent both with Truth and your ſelves; 'I did both weakly and raſhly too much defend your Perſons, (but not your 'unſound Principles) for which I am ſorry, and have begged Pardon of God; 'and I intreat both thee and *W. Penn* to Pardon me that Wrong, I hope I ſhall 'not fall into the like Offence. Thy idle Story about the Revolutions of hu-'mane Souls, which (as thou confeſſeſt) I Stated as an Hypotheſis, *i. e.* a bare 'Suppoſition, Refutes it ſelf; and therefore *I* need ſay no more to it, nor ſhall 'at preſent, having divers times in Print cleared my ſelf of thine and thy Bre-'threns injurious Accuſation therein.

I remain thy Real Friend,

Though ſuppoſed Enemy for telling the Truth,

G. Keith.

ERRATA.

PAge 2. *l.* 18, *after ſhed, r. for juſtification, p.* 3. *l.* 15. *after object, r. or foundation, p.* 4. *l.* 24. *in the Margin, for ſome, r. once, p.* 5. *l.* 22. *for hath, r. have, p.* 7. *l.* 16. *after world, r. beſide, p.* 8. *l.* 34. *for ſending, r. ſend, p.* 9. *l.* 11. *after* Faldo, *r. p.* 335. *l.* 14. *after Faith, r. in, l.* 18. *r. have let drop, p.* 10. *l.* 2. *in the Margin, r.* Barclay, *l.* 18. *r. from, l.* 29. *for plainly, r. vainly, l.* 41. *for known, r. know, p* 11. *l.* 24. *r.* 1667. *p.* 13. *from l.* 4. *at by to l.* 15. *r. within* [ ], *p.* 16. *l.* 11. *r. exiſtent, l.* 16. *after broken, r. p.* 11. *p.* 17. *l.* 3. *dele God and r. with the Father plainly, l.* 9. *r. Unſcripture-like, p.* 17. *l.* 16. *r. word God, p.* 22. *l.* 21. *after Sincerity, r.*], *p.* 25. *l.* 20. *r. is the end, l.* 21. *r. his Fleſh, p.* 26. *for force, r. price, p.* 28. *l.* 16. *r. place, p.* 30. *the five laſt lines ſhould have been Printed in the greater Letter, p.* 30. *l.* 11. *for prove, r. know, p.* 31. *l.* 38. *for miſtake, r. Injuſtice, p.* 32. *l.* 7. *r. inviſibly, p.* 32. *l.* 7. *r. in a perſonal, p* 32. *l.* 7. *r. viſibly, l.* 32. *for into, r. in, p.* 33. *l.* 1. *for them, r. then, p.* 34. *l.* 13. *for tele, r. tot, p.* 37. *l.* 9. *r. to plain, p.* 44. *l.* 41. *after words, r. the gift, p.* 45. *l.* 29. *for that, r. than p.* 45. *l.* 30. *for that, r. than, p.* 46. *l.* 14. *for yet, r. ye, p.* 47. *l.* 13. *for if, r. of, p.* 49. *for injurious, r. invidious, p.* 55. *l.* 13. *for if, r. of, p.* 56. *l.* 2. *after widening, r. differences in Doctrin, p.* 58. *l.* 33. *for the firſt, r. the* 11th. *p.* 61. *l.* 20. *r. ſame day month, p.* 62. *l.* 15. *for he ſaith, r. thou ſayſt p.* 63. *l.* 29. *dele not. Some other ſmall and mere literal Faults, and wrong Stops, are left to the Reader to Correct by his own Diſcretion.*

FINIS.